HOLY WAR THEOLOGY IN THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DAY OF THE LORD TRADITION

by

Devon Harvey Wiens

A Dissertation Presented to the
FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Religion)

August 1967

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
UNIVERSITY PARK
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90007

This dissertation, written by

Devon Harvey Wiens

under the direction of his Dissertation Committee, and approved by all its members, has been presented to and accepted by the Graduate School, in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Milton C. Kloetzel
Dean

Date September, 1967

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

Chairman

Ernest B. Koerner

Wallace MacGregor (Philosophy)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	AN INTRODUCTORY SURVEY	1
	The Gospels	2
	The Pauline Literature	4
	The Catholic Epistles	9
	The Apocalypse	10
II.	THE ANCIENT TRADITIONS OF HOLY WAR	12
	The Ancient Near East	13
	Israelite Holy War	16
	The Prophetic Application of Holy War Theology	22
	The Maccabees and Holy War Theology	29
	Jewish Apocalyptic and Holy War Theology	34
	Qumran and Holy War Theology	37
	Josephus, the Zealots and Holy War Theology	40
	The Early Church and Holy War Motifs	44
III.	THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION AND HOLY WAR THEOLOGY	47
	The Passion Narratives	50
	The Exorcism Narratives	64
	The Question of Zealotic Influence	68
IV.	THE DAY OF THE LORD TRADITION	76
	Origins and the Early Development of the Tradition	76
	The "Day" in Apocalyptic Literature	87
	Qumran and the "Day"	93

Chapter		Page
V.	THE DAY OF THE LORD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT	97
	The Synoptics	99
	The Pauline Literature	106
VI.	JESUS THE DAY	122
	Jesus and John the Baptist	124
	Jesus' First Sermon	127
	Jesus and the Thief	129
	The Resurrection and the Origins of Sunday	130
	An Agraphon and the Early Church	138
VII.	THE FUTURE APPLICATION ONCE MORE	143
	The Synoptics	144
	Paul	150
	The Apocalypse	152
CONCLUSION		157
BIBLIOGRAPHY		164

CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTORY SURVEY

The realm of the military is notorious for its intrusion into the varied aspects of life, frequently adding its touches even to the idiom of the religious community. Such blending of otherwise disjunctive spheres tends to produce a certain dilution in both spheres, but the robust nature of military parlance at the same time spells considerable tenacity, so that, among other results, the religious life is often pictured as a conflict between opposing forces.

The New Testament is not an exception to this phenomenon. Inasmuch as it originated contextually, the decidedly military tenor of its times has left its mark. This is the case in the various types of literature found therein: Gospels, Acts, Epistles and Apocalypse. It will not be necessary to enumerate all the occurrences of martial language;[1] suffice it to list the most obvious

---

[1]Such surveys are found in various works; for instance, see Hans Windisch, Der Messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum (Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1909); Adolf Harnack, Militia Christi (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1905) and Ragnar Leivestad, Christ the Conqueror (London: SPCK, 1954), works to which this writer is greatly indebted.

instances.

The Gospels. In the case of the Gospels, Luke evinces by far the greatest incidence of such thought. At the very outset, the Magnificat and Benedictus contain a considerable amount of warlike features, particularly 1.51,52:

> He has shown strength with his arm,
> he has scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts,
> he has put down the mighty from their thrones,
> and exalted those of low degree.[2]

In chapter eleven, Jesus' answer to the charge that his exorcisms result from his being in league with Βεεζεβοὺλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων echoes the world of soldiery:

> Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste [ἐρημοῦται], and house falls upon house [17] . . . When a strong man, fully armed, guards his own palace, his goods are in peace, but when one stronger than he assails him and overcomes him, he takes away his armor in which he trusted, and divides his spoil [τὴν αἵρει, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐπεποίθει, καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν].[3]

---

[2]It is Paul Winter's opinion that the Magnificat and Benedictus were originally Maccabaean war songs ("Magnificat and Benedictus--Maccabaean Psalms?," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 37 [1954], 328-347). Thus he says (341):

> There is nothing in the contents of the two hymns that would rule out the idea of their having been composed as Psalms of Praises incanted by a militant crowd before joining battle or as triumphal odes after victory had been achieved on the battlefield.

[3]That this language is both reminiscent of Greek notions of warfare and at the same time describes the conflict more in terms of an actual military engagement than do the Synoptic parallels (Matthew 12 and Mark 3) is obvious.

Jesus is cast in the role of one who brings dissension, even within domestic ranks, in 12.51: "Do you think that I have come to give peace on earth? No, I tell you, but rather division" [ἀλλ' διαμερισμόν].[4]

In the parable of the King Contemplating a Campaign (14.31,32), one finds military language per se; that is, in a literal vein:

> Or what king, going to encounter another king in war, will not sit down first and take counsel whether he is able with ten thousand to meet him who comes against him with twenty thousand? And if not, while the other is yet a great way off, he sends an embassy and asks terms of peace.

Again, the depiction of Jerusalem's catastrophic downfall occasions the use of martial thought. The taking of the city and the fate of its inhabitants is described in 9.43,44. Its frightful demise is portrayed further in 21.20-24:

> But when you see Jerusalem surrounded by armies, then know that its desolation has come near. Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains, and let those who are inside the city depart, and let not those who are out in the country enter it; for those are days of vengeance, to fulfil all that is written. Alas for those who are with child and for those who give suck in those days. For great distress shall be

---

[4] Here Luke does not go to the lengths of Matthew, who has 'sword' instead of 'division'. When one, however, recalls the result of a successful sword-thrust, Luke's term retains its harsh connotation; indeed, his source may have read 'sword', which he then changed to apply it to the following saying on Jesus as a disrupter of domestic tranquility.

> upon the earth and wrath upon this people; they will fall by the edge of the sword, and be led captive among all the nations; and Jerusalem will be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.

Continuing in the Little Apocalypse, Luke has it that the Eschaton will be preceded by reports of "wars and tumults" (21.9): "Nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom" (10).

Elsewhere, in 22.36-38, Jesus is made to echo the thought expressed in 12.51, that of the employment of force which his presence necessitates: "And let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one [36] . . . And they said, 'Look, Lord, here are two swords'. And he said to them, 'It is enough'" (38). Strangely enough, without for the moment attempting an explanation, these words stand in stark contrast to what he urges upon his followers, at the time of his seizure:

> And when those who were about him saw what would follow, they said, 'Lord, shall we strike with the sword?' And one of them struck the slave of the high priest and cut off his right ear. But Jesus said, 'No more of this!' And he touched his ear and healed him (22.49-51).

The Pauline Literature. Turning now to the Pauline literature, one notes a distinct fondness for war imagery. The subtle military tenor of Romans 6.12-14 is not self-evident, but it is nonetheless perceptible:

> Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal bodies, to make you obey their passions. Do not yield your members to sin as instruments [ὅπλα] of wickedness,

> but yield yourselves to God as men who have been brought from death to life, and your members to God as instruments of righteousness. For sin will have no dominion over you, since you are not under law but under grace.

Here ἁμαρτία, ἐπιθυμίας, ἀδικίας, νεκρῶν and νόμον are ranged over against θεῷ, ζῶντας, δικαιοσύνης and χάριν as opposing forces. The believer is cast in the crucible of decision; he is challenged to be what he is, to consecrate his members to God, under whose banner he now serves, and not to give opportunity to the enemy. This war within the members (μέλη) renders one captive to the law of sin, from which only God can deliver him (8.23-25).

Again, in Romans 13.11-14, the imminence of the Parousia behooves one to bestir himself and don battle dress:[5]

> For salvation is nearer to us now than when we first believed; the night is far gone, the day is at hand. Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light (ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους, ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός.) (11,12).

Except for a few ad hoc references, cast in interrogative form, the world of the military is bypassed in First Corinthians. Exceptions are a pair of rhetorical questions: "Who serves as a soldier at his own expense?" (9.7) and 14.8: "And if the bugle gives an indistinct

---

[5]That the putting on of the armor seems to be equated with the act of "putting on the Lord Jesus Christ" (14) seems highly significant and will be discussed at a later point.

sound, who will get ready for battle?"

On the other hand, the second Corinthian epistle makes conscious use of this constellation of ideas. Paul, in 2.14, hymns: τῷ δὲ θεῷ χάρις τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ χριστῷ. In chapter six, Paul states that, inasmuch as the heralded day of salvation is at hand, he commends himself, as a servant of God, in every way, "with the weapons of righteousness for the right hand and for the left" (διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν.

In 10.3-6 one meets with a full-fledged development of battle imagery; accordingly the entire passage merits citation in the original:

> Ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, 6 τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχοντες

---

6 Cf. Ephesians 6.12: ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα.

ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή.[7]

Philippians 2.25 introduces an idea which is capitalized upon in both Pauline and Deutero-Pauline materials. This is Paul's (and others) habit of referring to himself and his missionary co-laborers as soldiers. Here Epaphroditus is called "fellow soldier" (συστρατιώτην). Elsewhere, Timothy is charged to "wage the good warfare [στρατεύῃ τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν], holding faith and a good conscience" (First Timothy 1.18,19). Again, he is admonished to "fight the good fight of the faith" [ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως] in 6.12. No soldier can bank on civil treatment: "Take your share of suffering as a good soldier of Christ Jesus. No soldier on service gets entangled in civilian pursuits, since his

---

[7]Of this passage Hans Windisch says:

> Hier wird der Beruf des ap. Feldherrn P. und der messianische Charakter des von ihm geleiteten Kampfes nun ganz deutlich: er hat die Welt dem Christus zu unterwerfen . . . Dass solches Unterwerfungswerk auch die Bekämpfung von Irrlehrern, von Pseudognostikern und Sophisten und von Gegnern seiner Person in den Gemeinden einschliesst, ist abermals selbstverständlich.

Der Zweite Korintherbrief (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924), 298. First Maccabees 8.10 provides an approximate parallel:

> And that they, having knowledge thereof, sent against them a certain captain, and fighting with them slew many of them, and carried away captive their wives and their children, and spoiled them, and took possession of their lands, and pulled down their strongholds and brought them to be their servants unto this day.

aim is to satisfy the one who enlisted him" (Second Timothy 2.3,4). That which Timothy is commanded has already been achieved by Paul himself: "I have fought the good fight" (τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγώνισμαι).[8] In Philemen 2 the appellation συστρατιώτη falls on Archippus.

That the Ephesian letter[9] devotes considerable space to battle imagery is ostensible.[10] In the first place, it is Christ who has brought a cessation to certain hostilities:

> For he is our peace, who has made us both one and has broken down the dividing wall of hostility [τὸ μεσοτοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ λύσας, τὴν ἔχθραν] . . . thereby bringing the hostility to an end [ἀποκτείνας τὴν ἔχθραν ἐν αὐτῷ. And he came and preached peace to those who were near (2.14-17).

---

[8]Second Timothy 4.7. It is interesting that this fight is the grounds for Paul's (though these words may not stem from Paul himself) confidence that he will receive the crown of righteousness on the Day of Judgment.

[9]For our purposes, the question of Pauline authorship is not of pressing importance.

[10]In this and in numerous other respects, Ephesians mirrors Qumran ideology, so that this writer feels that the two literatures accrue from circles which were in the very closest of associations. Direct dependence is not, however, on this score, a necessary deduction. For an evaluation of the similarities, see K. G. Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte," New Testament Studies 7 (1960), 334-346; Ernst Käsemann, "Epheserbrief" in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Tübingen: J. C. B. [Paul Siebeck], 3rd ed., 1958), II. Band, 517, 518 and Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 4th ed., 1963), 299,300. Kuhn's conclusion is: "So ist die Schlussfolgerung eines Traditionszusammenhanges der Epheserbriefes mit den Qumrantexten in Sprache und Stil kaum zu umgehen" (337) (italics his).

But, it is supremely in the sixth chapter where one encounters a description of the Christian warfare:

> Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of his might. Put on the whole armor [πανοπλίαν] of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we are not contending against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world rulers of this present darkness, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Therefore take the whole armor of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the equipment of the gospel of peace; above all taking the shield of faith, with which you can quench all the flaming darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God (10-17).

First Thessalonians, which indisputably stems from Paul, echoes this call to arms: "But, since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation" (5.8).

Continuing, the author of Hebrews, in his encomium to the Old Testament heroes, includes in their list of accomplishments the fact that they ἐφυνιώθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολέμῳ, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλιναν ἀλλοτρίων (11.34).

<u>The Catholic Epistles</u>. James takes up a theme earlier used by Paul and, in the same vein, applies it to the spiritual level and, as a result, causes it to become, to a degree, otiose.

What causes wars, and what causes fightings among you?

> Is it not your passions that are at war in your members? You desire and do not have; so you kill. And you covet and cannot obtain; so you fight and wage war [μάχεσθε καὶ πολεμεῖτε] (4.1,2).

First Peter describes the war within, as Paul had already done: "Beloved, I beseech you as aliens and exiles to abstain from the passions of the flesh that wage war against your soul" (2.11). Whereas the enemy is oftentimes left undefined, he is clearly pointed out in 5.8,9; the staunch, unrelenting resistance required is consonant with the truculent aims of the foe:

> Be sober, be watchful. Your adversary [ὁ ἀντίδικος] the devil prowls around like a roaring lion, seeking someone to devour. Resist him, firm in your faith [ᾧ ἀντίστητε στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει] , knowing that the same experience of suffering is required of your brotherhood throughout the world.

<u>The Apocalypse</u>. Finally, as one might expect, the New Testament Apocalypse is brimming with imagery originating in the military sphere. The Thyatirans are advised: "He who conquers and who keeps my works until the end, I will give him power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron, as when earthen pots are broken in pieces . . ." In chapter six, the terrible horse-and-rider teams are epitomized in the description of the pale horse and Death, its rider: "And they were given power over a fourth of the earth, to kill with sword and with famine and with pestilence and by wild beasts of the earth."

It is obvious that the picture of the army of locusts, as depicted in chapter nine, has been influenced by Joel's account of the Day of the Lord. As in Joel, so here, there is first a description of the locusts, who "were like horses arrayed for battle" (7). This description is then transposed into a description of an actual army (15-19), whose number is "twice ten thousand times ten thousand" (16).

The scope of the war is enlarged yet further, so that one reads of a cosmological strife, in chapter twelve, between Michael and the Devil (7-12). In the next chapter, the beast who is invested with the dragon's authority, makes war against the saints and conquers them (καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ποιῆσαι πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτούς). One hears mention, in 16.14, of the call which goes out to the kings of the whole world "to assemble them for battle on the great day of God the Almighty" (συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος).

Finally, there is the awesome epiphany of the Word of God, sent to war against the beast and the kings of the earth (chapter 19):

> And the armies of heaven, arrayed in fine linen, white and pure, followed him on white horses. From his mouth issues a sharp sword with which to smite the nations, and he will rule them with a rod of iron; he will tread the wine press of the fury of the wrath of God the Almighty (14,15).

CHAPTER II

THE ANCIENT TRADITIONS OF HOLY WAR

To this point we have simply endeavored to indicate the wealth of martial stock found within the New Testament. If the foregoing be deemed an adequate representation of such idiom, we must proceed to inquire as to why such wealth remains, in view of the apparent dichotomy between the religious and military spheres. For, to be sure, it is usually conceded that the New Testament embodies a high ethic; what would be more incongruous than an implicit acknowledgement of the propriety of the ways of war, on the part of that ethic.

Part of our answer to this question would involve the belief that it is the practically ubiquitous notions of Holy War which have left their impress upon the literature of the New Testament. In such notions one indeed finds a coalescing of the two spheres. That this fusion is originally a product of theocratic society, wherein the functions of spiritual and military leadership are both relegated to the deity, has been amply demonstrated by various scholars.[1] The fruits of their labors will be

---

[1]Gerhard von Rad, Der heilige Krieg im alten

entered into in this work and will be employed to elucidate the New Testament backgrounds of the Holy War ideal. We shall later be concerned to discuss the significance of that background for the literature of the New Testament. To that end it is not deemed necessary to present a detailed analysis of the various cultures which those traditions energized; we will rather note the main features of the ideology in those peoples.

Though perhaps one cannot point to a Holy War theology proper, as that is understood in Israel, in the Ancient Near Eastern civilizations which antedate her, there are certain similarities. One need but recall the fierce struggle which Marduk, the newly-crowned leader of the gods, is forced to wage in order to subdue Tiamat, Chaos Incarnate:

> Then joined issue Tiamat and Marduk, wisest of gods.
> They strove in single combat, locked in battle.
> The Evil Wind, which followed behind, he let loose in her face.
> When Tiamat opened her mouth to consume him,
> He drove in the Evil Wind that she close not her lips.
> As the fierce winds charged her belly,
> Her body was distended and her mouth was wide open.
> He released the arrow, it tore her belly,

Israel (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951); Johannes Pedersen, Israel: Its Life and Culture (London: Oxford University Press, r.p., 1959), Volumes III and IV and Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961). Von Rad adverts occasionally to an older work by Fr. Schwally, Semitische Kriegsaltertumer; Volume I: Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel (Leipzig, 1901).

It cut through her insides, splitting the heart..
Having thus subdued her, he extinguished her life.[2]

It is obvious that one is involved here with mythology in its technical sense (i.e., stories of the gods). However, in that good prevails over evil in a life-and-death struggle, it may well be that such stories set the tone for later descriptions of human wars.

It is a truism that ideas of conflict between the gods are rampant in the literature of the ancient Near East. It was natural, then, to link a nation's battles with its gods. Accordingly, any war which the ancients undertook was never merely a conflict between mortals,

---

[2]"The Creation Epic"; Tablet IV, Lines 93-103 in James B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts (Princeton: University Press, 2d ed., 1955), 67. It is possible that historical events, in turn, lie in back of this mythological feud:

> At the root of the battle between Marduk or Enlil and Tiamat, between wind and water, there probably lies an age-old interpretation of the spring floods. Every spring the waters flood the Mesopotamian plain and the world reverts to a--or rather to 'the'--primeval watery chaos until the winds fight the waters, dry them up, and bring back the dry land.

"Mesopotamia" in H. and H.A. Frankfort, John A. Wilson and Thorkild Jacobsen, Before Philosophy (Baltimore: Penguin Books, r.p., 1964), 194,195.

but involved deities as well. All wars were religious wars.[3] But, when this step was taken, a certain demythologyzing was operative, for it was no longer strictly a case of wars between gods, but between gods and humans.[4] In this is to be seen the genius of Israelite faith, for, while it is possible to find vestiges of myth in her

---

[3]This was no less true of the later Greek civilization, which had its ἱεροὶ πόλεμοι. For instance, the wars which the amphictyony of Delphi conducted against any of its members who had violated the sacred rights of Apollo were given this name. Herodotus describes an event which took place when the Persian host, under Xerxes, was threatening to overrun the sacred courts of Delphi (8.37,38). Several strange things occurred: weapons of war moved of their own accord, thunderbolts fell on the Persians from the sky and "two pinnacles of rock, torn from Parnassus, came crashing and rumbling down amongst them, killing a great number . . ." These things were διὰ πάντων θαυμάτων ἄξια θωμάσαι μάλιστα (8.37.2). Not unexpectedly, these things produced a panic ( ) among the Persian troops and they fled. Commensurate with his quasi-secularism and his usual reticence to name the gods, Herodotus does not ascribe this activity to any particular divinity, though, inasmuch as it was Athene's temple which was most directly threatened, one would expect that he had her in mind.

[4]For the expression of these ideas in some other cultures, see Albrecht Goetze, "Warfare in Asia Minor," Iraq 25 (1963), 124-130, who notes the large part which gods play in warfare of that area. Cf. O.R. Gurney, The Hittites (Baltimore: Penguin Books, rev., 1964). Indeed, the concept of a holy war influenced almost all the ancients, as de Vaux, 258, points out:

> Among all the peoples of antiquity, war was linked with religion. It was begun at the command of the gods, or at least with their approval, manifested by omens; it was accompanied by sacrifices, and conducted with the help of the gods who ensured victory, for which they were thanked by an offering of part of the booty.

hymns of creation, myth in the pure sense is absent. Mythical accounts seem to have been taken over, revamped and molded to suit the historically-oriented nature of Hebrew thought. It seems, therefore, that this step was at the very first taken by Israel; one finds God participating, from the beginning, in human wars. This is not, of course, to overlook the possibility that the descriptions of Israel's wars are spun of a fabric to some degree common to other peoples and nations.[5]

Israelite Holy War. It is to Gerhard von Rad that modern Biblical scholarship is heavily indebted at this point, for it was he who revived the study of the Israelite institution of Holy War and traced its development and influence upon subsequent Old Testament literature.[6] We propose here only to summarize the constitutive aspects of this institution and to illustrate them from the sources.

---

[5]However, Helmer Ringgren feels that the "holy war is obviously a typically Israelite phenomenon. Up to now no evidence of anything comparable has been discovered in Canaan . . ." (Israelite Religion, translated by David Green [London: SPCK, 1966], 54). With respect to the question of Canaanite affinities, the institution, we would indeed grant, is unique.

[6]The classic statement is represented by his Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel, though it is employed in other of his works; e.g., see Studies in Deuteronomy (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1953), Chapter IV: "Deuteronomy and the Holy War" and Old Testament Theology (London: Oliver and Boyd; I, r.p., 1963; II, 1965), passim.

Von Rad,[7] as well as others,[8] provides such a summary. Thus, according to the sources, it is Yahweh who decides when to go to war; to learn of his decision, he is consulted when danger threatens (Judges 20.23,28; I Samuel 14.37; 23.2,4) by means of the ephod and sacred lots (I Samuel 23.9f; 30.7f). The trumpet call commonly summons the people to engage in the Holy War (Judges 3.27; 6.34f; I Samuel 13.3). Preparations are then undertaken before Yahweh (Numbers 32.20ff,27,29,32; Joshua 4.13). Inasmuch as the resultant battle is a cultic undertaking, since it proceeds under the divine aegis, the amphictyony is henceforth obliged to submit to various restrictions; indeed, the army itself stands under sacral classification. Consequently, the men are called to continence (I Samuel 21.6; II Samuel 11.11f) and ritual cleanliness (Joshua 3.5). The camp community must be ritually pure (Deuteronomy 23.9-14).

The central and most significant aspect of the Holy War, indeed that which essentially determines its "holy" character, is the fact that it is Yahweh's war (Numbers 21.14, where reference is made to the מלחמות

---

[7] Krieg, 6ff: "The Theory of a Holy War."

[8] de Vaux, chapter five: "The Holy War." Cf. L.E. Toombs, "War, Ideas of" in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Volume IV, 797, who summarizes von Rad's treatment in cogent fashion.

סֵפֶר מִלְחֲמוֹת; cf. I Samuel 18.17; 25.28). Israel's enemies are Yahweh's enemies (Judges 5.31; I Samuel 30.26). He himself marches in the van of the army (Deuteronomy 20.4; Judges 4.14; II Samuel 5.24) and fights for them (Exodus 14.4,14,18; Deuteronomy 1.30; Joshua 10.14,42; 11.6; 23.10 and Judges 20.35). He can accordingly be called a "man of war" (Exodus 15.3--אִישׁ מִלְחָמָה; cf. Isaiah 42.13). A fit description is given in Psalm 24:8: "Yahweh, strong and mighty, Yahweh, a mighty man of battle."[9]

According to von Rad, there is in the ancient wars no hint of synergism in the descriptions of the decisive acts of Yahweh.[10] A device employed to set in relief the unaided work of Yahweh is that of exuberant exaggeration: "The stories intentionally exaggerate the numerical disparity in order to give the honor of the

---

[9]Cf. Zephaniah 3.17; Numbers 10.35. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., "God the Warrior," Interpretation 19 (1965), 39, says: "The principal epithet for God in the Old Testament is 'Yahweh of Hosts,' which [despite the extensive discussion and disagreement the term has called forth] can hardly mean anything other than 'Yahweh of the armies,' whether heavenly, earthly, or both." See also Henning Fredricksson, Jahwe als Krieger: Studien zum alttestamentlichen Gottesbild (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1945), who divides his work into two parts: Yahweh as leader of an army and Yahweh as an individual fighter.

[10]Krieg, 13. De Vaux, 262, avers: "This is the principal fact: it was Yahweh who fought for Israel, not Israel which fought for its God." It must be said, however, that this emphasis represents a later theological understanding of the way these wars were fought. Indeed, such an interpretation of the ancient wars understands them exclusively as "holy wars."

victory to Yahweh alone."[11]

Such divine assistance makes victory a foregone conclusion; therefore, the combatants leave home with the certainty of victory (Joshua 2.24; 6.2,16; 8.1,18; 10.8, 19; Judges 3.28; 4.7,14; 7.9,15; 18.10; 20.28; I Samuel 14.12; 17.46; 23.4; 24.5; 26.8; I Kings 20.28).[12] Nevertheless, the exercise of faith in Yahweh's power is still indispensable; it is enjoined (Joshua 8.1; 10.8,25).[13]

War-cries commence the clash (Judges 7.20[14];

---

[11]Von Rad, Studies, 46nl.

[12]The formula used, in all these cases, is "I have given _____ into your hand" (נָתַתִּי בְּיָדְךָ).

[13]This dialectic between the indicative (Victory is assured.) and the imperative (Have faith!) is illustrated in Deuteronomy 20.2-4:

> And when you draw near to the battle, the priest shall come forward and speak to the people, and shall say to them, 'Hear, O Israel, you draw near this day to battle against your enemies: let not your heart faint; do not fear, or tremble, or be in dread of them; for the Lord your God is he that goes with you, to fight for you against your enemies, to give you the victory.'

[14]Though usually this chant is unidentified, it is given explicitly here: חֶרֶב לַיהוָה וּלְגִדְעוֹן. However, de Vaux, 259, is of the opinion that Numbers 10.35,36 also preserves some ancient battle-cries:

> And whenever the ark set out, Moses said, 'Arise, O Lord, and let thy enemies be scattered; and let them that hate thee flee before thee! And when it rested, he said, 'Return, O Lord, to the ten thousand thousands of Israel.'

Robert Bach, Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht und zum Kampf im alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch (Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 101, seconds what has been maintained about the war-cry: "Die Gattung der Aufforderung zum Kampf hat ihre Ursprüng in den heiligen Kriegen der 'Richter'-Zeit."

I Samuel 17.20; cf. II Chronicles 20.21f). At times trumpets were employed to mobilize and rally the fighters (Numbers 10.9; Judges 3.27; II Chronicles 13.12-15). Since the ark was the manifestation of Yahweh's presence (and thus a palladium) the people would raise the battle-cry when it hove into view (I Samuel 4.5f).

Inasmuch as Yahweh fights for his people, they are in the enviable position of enjoying superterrestrial aid. There are the attendant prodigies, as even nature is called into service: Yahweh throws down great stones from heaven (Joshua 10.11); he sends darkness (Joshua 24.7); the earth trembles, the heavens drop, the clouds drop water, the mountains quake and the stars fight for Israel (Judges 5). The result is that the enemy is thrown into confusion and routed (Exodus 15.14-16; 23.27f; Deuteronomy 2.25; 11.25; Joshua 2.9,24; 5.1; 10.2; 11.20; 24.12; Judges 4.15; 7.22; I Samuel 4.7; 7.10; 14.15,20).

The climactic act of the Holy War drama is the putting of the enemy under the ban (חרם), which involved the taking over of the spoil of Yahweh. The herem appears to have represented an extremely widespread custom in that day[15] and crops up repeatedly in the archaic accounts of Israel's wars (Numbers 21.2; 31.14-18; Deuteronomy 7.2;

---

[15]See, for instance, Wolfram von Soden, "Die Assyrer und der Krieg," Iraq 25 (1963), 131-141, especially 137.

13.13-18; 20.16,17; Joshua 2.34-35; 3.6,7; 6.18-24; 8.2; 10.28f; 11.14; Judges 21.11). Illustrative of this custom, in which the entire enemy population is ear-marked for the sword, are Samuel's instructions to Saul in I Samuel 15.3: "Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have; do not spare them, but kill both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass."[16]

The above analysis has abundantly demonstrated the fact that for Israel war was a sacred enterprise; hence the propriety of designating her wars "holy wars". In summary

> theologically the holy war appears as a responsibility of the Israelite under the Covenant, and cultically as a sacrificial act, initiated by the will of Yahweh, and carried out by people devoted to his service and ceremonially pure.[17]

---

[16]The viciousness of such wanton extermination is, of course, hardly reconcilable with an enlightened ethic; von Rad's explanation does not change this: "The most important thing for us is that the obligation to put under the ban was conceived by the Yahweh faith as an act of acknowledgement of Yahweh and his help" (Studies, 49). It is, notwithstanding this fact, important to be aware of the significance of that practice within the theology of Holy War.

[17]L.E. Toombs, 797. De Vaux echoes this conclusion (258):

> This means that war is a sacred action, with its own particular ideology and rites; this ideology, these rites, give it a specific character of its own, and single it out among the other wars of antiquity, where the religious aspect was something accessory.

See also von Rad, Krieg, 14.

The Prophetic Application of Holy War Ideology. With the settled life and increasing urbanization which the conquest of the land brought in its wake the old traditions were bound to archaicize. The territorial expansion under the monarchy did not, to any great extent, recall these ideals, perhaps due to the secularistic tenor of the times. That tenor is illustrated, among other ways, by the fact that David used foreign mercenaries, a practice which certainly clashes with the intensely patriotic spirit of the old days. In the light of this, it is remarkable to see the classical prophets revivi[illegible] the traditions, though they tailored them to match the contemporary scene. Inasmuch as our purpose at this point is to offer a representative summary rather than an exhaustive analysis, we shall refer only to the most conspicuous examples.

Isaiah five describes the apparition-like advent of a nation which Yahweh is said to raise up against Israel. Verse 26 consists of the call to arms; the awesome terror which the foe inspires is next depicted (27-29), after which one finds the inveterate portrayal of the attendant prodigies (30).

Probably what is the most extensive and limpid use of the ancient traditions is to be found in Isaiah thirteen, which is usually considered to be an anonymous

oracle against Babylon.[18] The usual features of a Holy War make their appearance here. First, one notes the call to arms (1-3). The divine initiative is stressed in verses 4 and 5: it is Yahweh himself who musters the host and they become the ready instruments of his vengeance, so that they can be described as "the Lord and the weapons of his indignation, to destroy the whole earth." Trepidation seizes the hearts of men.[19] Verses 10 and 13 allude to the celestial portents which again attend the onslaught. Finally, the woe and devastation which issue in the wake of battle are enumerated in gruesome detail, in 14-22. Among the results, one hears talk of Babylon left uninhabited, save as it is a haunt for jackals, hyenas and satyrs.[20]

En passant, one notes that chapter thirty-four, which paints the consequences of Yahweh's ire in vivid colors, contains a collage of ancient Holy War characteristics. For example, here all the nations of earth are

---

[18]See Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction, translated by Peter R. Ackroyd (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965), 319.

[19]So much so that they are said to be "in anguish like a woman in travail" (13.8), which becomes a perennial feature in the stock of ideas surrounding the Holy War; the Septuagint reads: καὶ ὠδῖνες αὐτοὺς ἕξουσιν ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης .

[20]Concerning this graphic tableau, von Rad says: "The war is made to take on gigantic dimensions; not single warriors but whole nations stream to the muster" (Old Testament Theology II, 120).

the objects of his wrath; he has "doomed them, has given them over for slaughter (הֶחֱרִים אֹתָם לַטִּבְחָה), which is equivalent to saying, as was the case in the earlier traditions, that he has put them to the ban.

Turning elsewhere, the oracles of Jeremiah reveal scattered, discursive references to Holy War. Though one misses the verbose treatment which these ideas received at the hands of Isaiah, one finds several points at which the ideology is employed in miniature, of which 51.27-37 is an example. Here there is an extensive focusing on the results of the divine denouement (e.g., disquietude and depopulation).

Joel evinces an avid interest in the tradition of Israelite Holy War. Regardless of whether his description of the scourge of locusts is mythological, historical or, more strictly, eschatological, it is apparent that the motifs stemming from Israel's ancient incursions into war have informed his account. The day in which Yahweh leads his army into war is one of darkness, gloom and clouds (2.2); it is terrible (2.11); the earth quakes and the heavens tremble (2.10). As usual, the army produces consternation: "Before them peoples are in anguish, all faces grow pale" (2.6). A little later, the community is summoned to defensive action by the blast of the trumpet (2.15). The sacral nature of the conflict is implied in the command to sanctify the congregation and in the order

to abstain from the normal marital relations (2.16). The emphasis on the devastating effects of the war is much in purview (1.15-20; 2.3; 3.19).

It appears that the more spectacular features of the wars in which Yahweh himself went forth as a warrior[21] were of special fascination for the authors of the prophetic books. Zephaniah, for instance, emphasizes the harsh nature of the day in which Yahweh will mete out his punishment; it will be bitter, full of wrath, distress, anguish, ruin, devastation, darkness, gloom, having been announced by trumpet blast and battle cry (1.14-16).

Having hastily surveyed the elements of the ancient Holy War traditions which are preserved in the writings of Israel's classical prophets, one must immediately add that they undergo considerable transformation at the same time. Stated as succinctly as possible, the tradition is at once both eschatologized and mythicized. In the first place, whereas, in the time of the former wars the various accompanying phenomena were employed to describe real, historical wars, it is obvious that these same phenomena are utilized in the prophetic literature to portray the events surrounding an eschatological war. The question as to whether this war is regarded by these writers as actually to take place as described is a moot

---

[21]Zephaniah 3.17: "The Lord, your God, is in your midst, a warrior who gives victory."

one; the fact is that the temporal perspective has shifted from the past to the future. Doxologies are now sung not solely on the basis of what Yahweh has done in the past, but only as these past acts serve to establish what he will do in the future.

Several effects follow from this reorientation. Faith assumes a more onerous pose. Confidence was, of course, mandatory, in the ancient time, but this confidence was then constantly rewarded with vindications of Yahweh's might. Now, however, one has only the word of the prophet as regards the future (though an immediate future, no doubt). The sedentariness of the monarchial age imposed a certain disinclination, on the part of the populace, to expect the miraculous intervention of Yahweh. Counsels of despair prevailed in some quarters, as it was all too obvious that Israel was surrounded by nations against which she proved relatively impotent. However, such defeatism is but indicative of the fact that a realistic policy of coexistence had been adopted. It is also illustrative of the fact that Yahweh just did not lead the nation any more against the enemy at the drop of a hat. Faith has necessarily, therefore, to be shunted to the future. That is the time when Yahweh, the man of war, will once more go forth as in days of yore.

Again, the military emphases in the prophets can be said, as we have already intimated, to have been

reoriented along mythological lines. This, in effect, means that a certain petrifaction has set in, as the traditions have been wrenched by the exigencies of history from the day-to-day experience of the people. They are now more remote, both temporally and spatially. It is a case of God acting Then and not a case of God with Israel acting Now. Thus, as we said, a hardening of the categories results, with age-old attributes reigning supreme. History fails to evince the kind of perpetual encounter between Yahweh and the enemy which would add vitalizing touches to past impressions of Holy War.

Further evidence which corroborates our insistence that there is an increasingly mythological strain is found in the fact that more and more the exclusive action of Yahweh is emphasized; militaristic prowess is relegated to him alone. Inasmuch as the future time of vindication is referred to as the Day of Yahweh, one is logically prepared to expect that the war which will then be waged will be exclusively under his aegis. In view of this monergism, it follows that Yahweh can turn the fortunes of war against his own people, since he is not dependent on human agency. This is in marked contrast with the earlier times, when Yahweh in concert with his Elect stretched out his mighty hand. For, even if suggestions of synergism are missing in the accounts of the early wars, it is a plain fact that Yahweh did not war without

his people.[22]

With the passing of the golden age of prophecy, it is evident that dominant motifs occurring in these writings lapsed into comparative desuetude. For example, one might compare the central significance which the events in Israel's Heilsgeschichte play in the prophets, as over against the Wisdom materials. This is true, to a degree, of the tradition of Holy War as well. Never again was there to be such an enthusiastic retention and modification of the ancient theology. There were, however, various historical periods when patriotic outbursts paved the way, spontaneously, it seems, for a spirited

---

[22]This matter deserves amplification. Our contention that there is an increasing insistence on the sole action of Yahweh does not contemn the fact that he is so represented in the early wars. This is primarily a literary problem; it is likely that monergism is a late view which was projected onto the ancient traditions and is therefore of a piece with similar views projected into the future. This may be seen in the work of the Deuteronomistic theologian, who so frames his work that

> the story of Gideon's war against the Midianites [Judges 6,7] pushes this idea of the all-sufficiency of Yahweh's action to the furthest possible extreme--Yahweh had given orders to reduce the number of the fighting men, and then he only stationed those left around about the enemy's camp; within the area in which Yahweh worked his deed they did not so much as set foot. The miracle came down from above, as it were into a vacuum--so rigorously does the narrator exclude the idea of any human cooperation. This is clearly the highly stylised idea of the event held by later generations, since in the actual old holy wars there is no doubt that the men of Israel too fought fiercely.

Von Rad, Theology I, 328, 329. Cf. Pedersen, 613, who voices similar views.

recrudescence of the ideas of the good old days. Such a renascence occurred during the Maccabean Era, when the glow of nationalistic ardor resurrected ideas which had long lain dormant in disconsolate hearts.

The Maccabees and Holy War Theology. It is not necessary to trace the history of the Maccabean Era. Suffice it to say that the blasphemous dealings of Antiochus Epiphanes had greatly incensed his Jewish subjects, who now pinned their hopes on the Maccabees to rectify the overweening grievances. The spirit in which Mattathias and his sons war is inspired by the ancient Holy War ideology.[23]

---

[23]Thus, Martin Hengel notes that "der Kampfselbst wurde als heiliger Krieg betrachtet" (Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur judischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. Bis 70 N. Chr. [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961], 177). Again,

> die Religionsnot unter Antiochus Epiphanes erweckte die Vorstellung vom heiligen Krieg zu neuem Leben... Die 'merkwurdig säkulare Auffassung' des 1. Makkabäerbuches lässt zwar den charsmatischen Charakter des Kampfes zurücktreten, aber zumindest in der Frühzeit des Freiheitskrieges erscheint dieser noch deutlich genug (278).

This view is to be preferred to that of de Vaux, who admits the resemblances (266), but is prevented "from taking the Maccabean war as a holy war" (though he terms it a war of religion) because, in his words, "the Maccabees and their men are not inspired by God; God did not order the war and he does not intervene directly in it." The latter appears here to indulge in semantic quibbling; at any rate, Mattathias and sons would certainly have been aghast at such a categorical denial. See also William Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956), whom Hengel follows. One might have recourse also to the Book of Judah, which was written in Maccabean times to steel its readers for the fight. See 4.6f; 6.19; 9.7f,14 for Holy War motifs.

As in the former days, the disparity of numbers between the camps is emphasized, thereby adding prestige to the fortunes of the outnumbered. When his men protest this inequality, Judah replies in strident tones:

> It is an easy thing for many to be hemmed in by the hands of a few. There is no difference in the sight of Heaven to save by many or by few[24] [οὐκ ἔστιν διαφορὰ ἐναντίον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ σώζειν ἐν πολλοῖς ἢ ἐν ὀλίγοις] . Victory in battle does not depend on the size of an army, but rather on strength that comes from heaven[25] (I Maccabees 3.18,19).

Preparations for the battle echo familiar strains as well. Ritualistic purity is a precondition to engaging in warfare (3.46-49). The trumpet is sounded and the war-cry rings out (3.54; 4.13; 5.31-33; 6.33; 8.45; 9.12,13; 16.8; II Maccabees 12.37; 13.15). A cry for divine assistance goes up to heaven (I Maccabees 4.10,40; 9.46;

---

[24]This disparity is noted elsewhere: 4.8,9; 6.41; 9.6-9.

[25]Cf. 3.22: "He Himself will shatter them before us" (καὶ αὐτὸς συντρίψει αὐτοὺς πρὸ προσώπου ἡμῶν). The presence of such language tends to argue strongly against de Vaux's implicit contention that God was merely a by-stander in those desperate days. See also 3.44: "The congregation gathered together to be ready for war, and to pray and to seek mercy and compassion."

II Maccabees 11.6; 12.6,28,36; 15.21-24[26],26). Of special interest is the following supplication, which combines various archaic motifs. Judah prays:

> Blessed art thou, O Savior of Israel, who staved off the charge of the mighty man by the hand of thy servant David, and didst deliver the camp of the Philistines into the hands of Jonathan, son of Saul, and his armor-bearer. In the same way hem in this camp by the hand of thy people Israel, and let them be put to shame in spite of their army and their horsemen. Make them cowardly. Melt the boldness of their strength. Let them quake at their destruction. Cast them down with the sword of those that love thee, and let all who know thy name praise thee with hymns (4.30-33).

The consequence of such entreaty is that panic and fear seize the enemy (II Maccabees 12.22) and apparitions confound him (II Maccabees 2.21; 12.22). The taking of the spoils (the שָׁלָל) is a practice of Maccabean warfare as well (II Maccabees 8.27,28,30,31).

It is our considered judgment that the ancient traditions of Holy War are resuscitated, in large measure, in the Maccabean literature. The fact that God does not

---

[26]In 15.22 one finds Judah, in entreating God, referring to the spectacular discomfiture of the host of Sennacherib, as recorded in II Kings 18, an event which is repeatedly adverted to in the Maccabean literature. Farmer, 180, avers:

> The recognition that victory in battle for the Israelites was due to the strength of their covenant God, mighty in war, whether that recognition be made in prayer before battle or in hymn after battle, is an authentic note of Jewish nationalism in the Greco-Roman period reaching back into the pre-exilic history of Israel. So long as their war was a Holy War, the Israelites were encouraged to believe that ultimate victory was assured in spite of the odds against them.

play as important a role in these latter wars as he did in the time of the Judges is not telling proof against this conclusion, but is explicable on the basis of the doctrine of severe transcendence which obtained in the world of the Maccabees.[27] As a result, one finds a deliberate avoidance of the divine name; appellations such as σωτὴρ Ἰσραήλ, οὐρανός (or ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βοήθεια), τὸν ὕψιστον and κτίστης τοῦ κόσμου are employed.[28] The numerous other features which were standard in the early traditions tend to cancel out this failure to ascribe explicitly to God the initiation of the war and the leadership of the army. This, of course, is no insignificant omission: what distinguishes Holy Wars from other wars (even religious wars) is the fact that the deity is thought of as being in command. Actually, however, as has already been intimated, God is by no means absent. His aid is invoked frequently; it is several times stated that it is he who performs feats of valor through the

---

[27]Indeed, this is a distinguishing characteristic of Middle Platonism, which was contemporary with the Maccabean Age.

[28]At other points, mention of the Law serves to incite the people to military action. One should add, however, that there seems to be a pronounced tendency to surmount this reticence in naming the divine in the later Maccabean literature (Books II, III, IV). The fact that this may accrue from differences in authorship (cf. the varying preferences for "Jew" and "Hebrew", as titles for the people) is not strictly apposite; the contrast is obvious.

Maccabees and oftentimes one reads of prayers of thanksgiving to him for having wrought victory.

Indeed, in a certain sense, the Maccabean application of Holy War theology aligns itself closer with the original ideas than does the prophetic application. For, even as in the time of the Judges, so in the Maccabean era, any possibility of God's taking the field against Israel was unknown. Yet such is at times the case, as is well-known, in the Old Testament prophets (e.g., Isaiah five, Amos five, Joel one and two and Zephaniah one). Yahweh is there free to effect his judgments upon whichever nation deserves such retribution.[29] During the time of the Maccabees, one can say that it is taken as a matter of course that the wishes and destiny of the Jews are consanguineous with those of their God. This is not to deny the fact that God is not described as taking the

---

[29]See also Jeremiah six, of which J. Alberto Soggin says that it describes a Holy War against Israel, led by Yahweh at the head of other peoples ("Der prophetische Gedanke uber den heiligen Krieg, als Gericht gegen Israel," Vetus Testamentum 10 [1960], 79). Elsewhere (80) he seconds our own position:

> . . . der hl. Krieg in der prophetischen Theologie sich nicht bloss auf einen Widerbelebungsversuch der alten Institution beschränkt,--in welchem Fall sie sich schwerlich von einer gewissen, vielleicht nationalistischen, Einseitigkeit hätte freihalten können--sondern sich in einer neuen Gestaltung des alten Brauches kundtut, in welcher Israel gar nicht notwendigerweise nur das Mittel Gottes zu seinem Zweck ist, sondern auch Gegenstand des Zornes Gottes sein kann, zu dessen Vollstreckung feindliche Völker gebraucht werden können.

direct hand in their combat that he did in the time of Joshua and the judges. To the extent that he is seen as involved, however, his lot is implicitly destined to be cast on the side of his people. What one finds, accordingly, is a far greater tendency to stress the cooperation between God and his Chosen.[30]

Jewish Apocalyptic and Holy War Theology. Since this preliminary material is to a degree common knowledge, we shall continue merely to summarize the evidence. It is clear that the notion of Holy War has left its impress as well in the apocalyptic literature, which arose at approximately the same time as the Maccabean writings. In all fairness, however, one should perhaps not retain the usual designation ("Holy War") for this literature; though considerable attention is given to the eschatological

---

[30]Before taking leave of the Maccabean literature, one should take time at least to peruse IV Maccabees. In Ragnar Leivestad's words: "Of particular interest is the 'martyrological' application of military and athletic terms which is predominant in IV Maccabees" (Christ the Conqueror [London: SPCK, 1954], 22). See 1.11; 6.10; 7.3f; 8.1; 9.6,30; 11.20f; 17.24. Indeed, the martyrs therein fight a holy war: Ἀληθῶς γὰρ ἦν ἀγὼν θεῖος ὁ δι' αὐτῶν διεξενημένος (17.11).

conflict[31] (even "Messianic wars"), the traditional motifs crop up rather infrequently.

In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Levi is described as a warrior who leads the war of the Lord. Accordingly, he is unconquerable: "But they shall not be able to withstand Levi; for he shall wage the war of the Lord, and shall conquer all your hosts" (οὐ δυνήσονται πρὸς Λευι ἀντιστῆναι ὅτι πόλεμον κυρίου πολεμήσει).[32] Particularly interesting is the description of the Heavenly One's appearance to discomfit the Gentiles, as found in the Assumption of Moses:

> For the Heavenly One will arise from His royal throne,
> And He will go forth from His holy habitation
> With indignation and wrath on account of His sons.
> And the earth shall tremble: to its confines shall it be shaken:
> And the high mountains shall be made low
> And the hills shall be shaken and fall.
> And the horns of the sun shall be broken and he shall be turned into darkness;

---

[31]That which most modern scholars describe as "Holy War" ideology in Late Judaism, Hans Windisch, 10ff, termed "Messianische Krieg". Actually, the "Messianic War" is but Holy War gone eschatological. Windisch provides abundant evidence for such ideology in Jewish eschatology (10-27). See, for example, I Enoch 16.2; 85-90; 91.12; 94.6f,9f; 95.3,7; 98.12; 99.6; 104.3; Jubilees 23.20; Testament of Levi 18; Testament of Dan 5 and Assumption of Moses 10.

[32]Testament of Simeon 5.5; cf. Testament of Reuben 6.12; Testament of Dan 5.10f. Hengel, 279, 280, says: "Auch diese Vorstellung [Yahweh as Warrior] wurde von der apokalyptischen Literatur übernommen, wobei sich Gott jedoch nicht nur gegen die Feinde Israels wandte, sondern auch gegen die hinter jenen stehenden dämonischen Mächte vorging."

> And the moon shall not give her light, and be turned wholly into blood.
> And the circle of the stars shall be disturbed.
> And the sea shall retire into the abyss,
> And the fountains of waters shall fail,
> And the waters shall dry up.
> For the Most High will arise, the Eternal God alone,
> And He will appear to punish the Gentiles,
> And He will destroy all their idols (10.3-7).[33]

It is true enough that most frequently in the Pseudepigraphical literature the battle is directed against mythical foes;[34] e.g., demons and evil angels, who are led by the Evil One (or Satan, Beliar), though the Gentiles sometimes represent the opposition.[35] But the descriptive features of the conflict most likely trace their origins to the old narratives describing Israelite Holy War. So that

> denn entspricht in der Apokalyptik der Gedanke, dass der grosse Umschwung, der Welten mit dem Gericht zusammenhängt, das Gott an den bösen Gewalten vollstreckt, oder genauer mit einem Kampf, in welchem Gott jene besiegt.[36]

We conclude, in Hans Windisch's words: "In

---

[33]For a similar description see I Enoch 1.4-9.

[34]This development doubtless helps explain the shift, which one finds in the New Testament, from attention to earthly foes to concentration on those of a cosmic nature.

[35]However, it would appear that the battle lines are really drawn ethically, not ethnically. Thus, it would be accurate to say that the Gentiles are not opposed qua Gentiles, but because of their greater evil. The wicked among the Jews fall into the same camp oftentimes.

[36]Wilhelm Bousset, Die Religion des Judentums im Späthellenistischen Zeitalter (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1926), 251.

mannigfachen Formen ist der messianische Kampf als ein Hauptakt in der jüdischen Eschatologie entwickelt worden."[37]

Qumran and Holy War Theology. One should turn next to a look at the Qumran materials. Though some of the other works display leanings toward a Holy War theology, it is supremely the Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness which illustrates these views.[38] Whether this work reflects an actual state of military preparedness,[39] is patterned after contemporary Roman military manuals[40] or is to be taken as an

---

[37] P. 27.

[38] At this point even de Vaux adopts the majority view: "One can, of course, point to external similarities with the Books of Maccabees, but in the Qumran writing the struggle is evidently regarded as a holy war" (266, 267). Cf. Otto Betz, "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," Novum Testamentum 2 (1957), 116: "Der Charakter diese endzeitlichen Kampfes [the War Scroll] ist stark von der Tradition des heiligen Kriegs bestimmt wie sie im alten Testament hervortritt."

[39] J.T. Milik, Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea, translated by John Strugnell (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1959), 123. Frank Moore Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961), 61n16, suggests the possibility that the Essenes participated in the war against the Romans.

[40] K.M.T. Atkinson, "The Historical Setting of the 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness'," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 40 (1958), 272-297; Yigael Yadin (ed.), The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness (Oxford: University Press, 1962), 16,17; and, with qualifications, M. Avi-Yonah, "The 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of

allegorical application of ancient Israelite traditions,[41] the Holy War ideological background is at once evident.

One hears of the traditional prayer before battle:

> . . . Thou art He who told us aforetime that Thou wouldst be in our midst, a great and awful God, to make spoil of our enemies before us. Thou also art He who taught us from of old for all our generations saying: When ye draw near unto the battle, the priest is to stand and speak to the people saying, 'Hear, O Israel, ye are drawing near this day unto battle against your enemies. Fear not, neither let your hearts grow soft, neither be dismayed nor affrighted before them, for your God is marching with you to do battle for you against your foemen to the end that He may save you' (10.1-5).[42]

Elsewhere, there are exhortations to the troops (15.6ff), songs of return and victory (14.2-18) and a special role is played by the priests (7.9ff). The presence of military standards seems ubiquitous (e.g., 3.12-

---

Darkness' and Maccabean Warfare," Israel Exploration Journal 2 (1952), 2:

> In spite of its obvious character as a military allegory, it is nevertheless clear that the writer modelled his ideal warfare on the actual practice of his times, and once had the occasion actually to observe it or at least to learn about it from eyewitnesses.

[41]Betz, 124; Hengel, 284-287; George H. Williams, Wilderness and Paradise in Christian Thought: The Biblical Expression of the Desert in the History of Christianity and the Paradise Theme in the Theological Idea of the University (New York: Harpers, 1962), 19,20 and Cyril H. Powell, The Biblical Concept of Power (London: Epworth Press, 1963), 52n33.

[42]Translation by Theodor H. Gaster, The Dead Sea Scriptures (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., rev. ed., 1964). The citation is from Deuteronomy 20.3,4; this, combined with other references to the Deuteronomistic history-work, argues for the reliance of the Dead Sea community on that particular version of Holy War theology.

5.2). Furthermore, the usual trumpets and war-cries play important parts (7.9-9.9). Also, the necessity of ritual purity is sounded:

> No toddling child or woman is to enter their camps from the moment they leave Jerusalem to go to war until they return; neither is anyone that is lame or blind or halt, or that has a long-standing blemish in his flesh or that is afflicted with any manner of bodily contagion, to go with them to war" (7.3-7).[43]

Seemingly, the struggles of the Maccabees have influenced the Essene materials,[44] so that the former have served as the historical intermediary by which the archaic conceptions are preserved in the literature of the Covenantors. Thus, on the basis of the foregoing discussion, one can say that this whole complex of military thought seems to have captivated the minds and fancies of both sectarian and "normative" Judaism in the Greco-Roman world. One might deduce several reasons as

---

[43]If scholarly support be required, Hengel, 287, says:

> Die Kriegsrolle bildet so den Höhepunkt der Tradition vom heiligen Krieg. Als eschatologisches Gemälde enthällt sie einerseits die alttestamentliche Kriegstradition in ihrer ganzen Breite und hat andererseits einen tiefen dualistisch-metaphysischen Hintergrund.

[44]Avi-Yonah, 3,4, is of the opinion that the Maccabean wars influenced the Qumranites much more than did Hellenistic warfare. For there are, in the War Scroll, two major exceptions to the common military practice of the age, which are, however, native to Maccabean warfare. First, there is a peculiar prominence given to the "spoilers" and "collectors of booty" in the army of the "Sons of Light". Second, there are special signals given prior to ambush. Furthermore, the list of enemies closely parallels the list of the Maccabees (See I Maccabees 4.22; 5.3-6,66 and II Maccabees 10.17).

to why this should have been so. The most significant datum would perhaps be the desperate lot of the Jews during those years, which kindled apocalyptic flames and shaped the promise of a more felicitous future in terms of a militant casting off of the chains of the oppressor. At any rate, the fact remains that the promise which the ancient traditions of Holy War held out to those who were heirs to such traditions proved particularly amenable to them; they were, consequently, taken over.[45]

Josephus, the Zealots and Holy War Theology. No doubt many who were involved in the revolt against Rome which resulted in the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD were enamoured of such ideas and were seeking to realize them. Josephus, though purporting to write the history of the period, is not a completely reliable witness for such ideas, for he unabashedly turns these traditions against the Jews.[46] It is now the Romans who march under the banner of the Lord.

---

[45] Thus, T.W. Manson, The Servant-Messiah (Cambridge: University Press, r.p., 1961), 8, opines:

> We have thus to reckon with the fact that any thinking Jew in this period [the Hellenistic era] might quite reasonably look upon armed revolt against the foreigner not merely as a patriotic act, but also as a religious protest against insult offered to Almighty God. A war for Jewish freedom was also a holy war, a war for the kingdom of God.

[46] History of the Jewish War, passim, but especially Book Four. Dio Cassius describes the Roman campaigns against the Jews with similar motifs (XLIX).

Such a betrayal of the national legacy is nothing but a literary fiction, deriving from the change of heart undergone by this Jewish Alcibiades. Inasmuch as he had forsaken the ways of his fathers, this refacing of the old ideas is not totally unexpected. As a matter of fact, in this respect he is but perpetuating another cycle of tradition which stressed that it is not inconceivable that God might turn against his own people. Yet, while the prophets had occasionally warned of such dread possibilities, they did so out of genuine concern for the fortunes of their people, while Josephus writes from a heart full of treachery. Consequently, he has successfully beclouded the issue, so that the possibility of our recovering the thinking of the Jews involved in this war is vastly hampered. In Farmer's words:

> Certainly Josephus, who was an eyewitness to the whole tragic event [the Fall of Jerusalem] . . . was able to write about the war as if from its very beginning, so far from being a Holy War, it had indeed been contrary to the will of God. Nevertheless, we must make every effort to get behind this interpretation Josephus places upon the war to the facts he records as he describes the development of the conflict. So to do is to see a people caught up in a war, which, however mistaken they might have been, was believed by them to be a Holy War--no doubt for some the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness.[47]

It is a commonplace that this Zealotic element

---

[47] P. 185,186. The present writer, as already evidenced, carries Farmer's argument one step further. Not only does Josephus not represent the Jews as waging a holy war, but he seems almost to represent the Romans as so doing.

within Judaism intermittently took up the hazardous affair of fomenting revolt. This movement has not received sufficient attention, but there is today a renewed burst of scholarly disquisition, as regards that area.[48] We shall want, at a later time, to discuss the relations of Jesus with the Zealots; our purpose in introducing them at this point is to show the degree to which they expressed their ambitions in a manner similar to that of the Essenes, the Maccabees and the Apocalyptists. Those who would assent to this verdict as to their close relationship include Oscar Cullmann, who has evinced a particular interest in the fortunes of this group. It is his feeling that it was among the Zealots that the

> theocratic ideal finds its sharpest expression. For its realization the Zealots preached a holy war; and they not only preached it; they secretly prepared for it, menacing the Roman garrison by individual resistance-actions and uprisings. . . .[49]

It is necessary at this point to give attention

---

[48] See B. Salomonsen, "Some Remarks on the Zealots with Special Regard to the Term 'Qannaim' in Rabbinic Literature," New Testament Studies 12 (1966), 164:

> It is well known that the interest of scholars in the Zealots has increased steadily since the Second World War. Previously the Zealots were merely dealt with in encyclopaedias and general surveys as part of Late Judaism, but now the movement is being studied thoroughly for two specific reasons: first, to present a detailed history of the Zealots, and secondly, to consider their relations to other contemporary groups.

[49] The State in the New Testament (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), 10.

to a methodological consideration. Granted that the Zealots were anxious to divest the Jewish state of the Roman hegemony and that in the means by which they thought to effect this they were evidently inspired by the ancient Holy Warriors, the fact is that their exploits are not described in the traditional manner of a Holy War. That they were never able to implement their goals on a wide scale does not explain this fact adequately, for the Essenes, who probably never engaged in actual warfare either, yet exploited the doctrines of Holy War.

What is deducible from the foregoing discussion is that the Holy War tradition is first and foremost a literary tradition. If there happened to be a writer perspicacious enough to note the similarities between any given war and the ancient records of Israelite Holy War, this meant that the tradition would be preserved. Accordingly, inadvertently to define any war with religious overtones as a Holy War is to disregard this rudimentary fact. What is requisite is that the standard emphases recur in the literature.

Having stipulated the above, one can go on to say that the years which marked the rise of the Christian religion did not mark the end of such ideas.[50] Indeed, it

---

[50]This writer finds himself in hearty agreement with W. R. Farmer's opinion:

> After all the dust which has been stirred up by the Dead Sea Scrolls has finally settled, we may well find

can be safely said that centuries would elapse before the sands of such motifs would run out. Though it is our primary purpose to elucidate the background, not the foreground of the New Testament,[51] one ought to pause briefly to clarify the latter.

The Early Church and Holy War Motifs. As concerns the development of the "Holy War" motifs in early Christianity,[52] attention should be called to the prevailing mentality of early Syrian Christianity. This primitive, militant community was possessed of an irrefragable "covenant consciousness".[53] Arthur Vööbus characterizes it most limpidly:

> The Covenanters are the fighters in the army of God. The ethos that stems from this is understood in terms of warfare. As the function of the priests is conceived so that this is to blow their trumpets signalling the engagement in battle with the enemy, so that

---

> that John the Baptist, spiritual activity in the Judean Wilderness, and the Maccabean heritage are all far more important for an understanding of Christian origins than we have ever expected (172n5).

[51]For it is certainly possible that the New Testament itself has influenced the concepts found in the later literature.

[52]Such a development is sketched by Harnack, 5ff.

[53]Inasmuch as the title of one of the works stemming from the Dead Sea ("Damascus Covenant") suggests Syrian provenance, one wonders whether the affinities between the literature of the two groups would argue for a relationship of dependence. The Odes of Solomon apparently hark back as well to a common milieu. See 8.7; 9.6,9, 12; 18.6 and 29.9.

> of the fighters is to be in the harness to fight bravely in the heat of the battle in the army of God.[54]

As frequently appears to have happened, the fact that the flames of militancy were not fanned by an actual conflict meant that the fight was increasingly spiritualized. However, the suggestion that the foe was not real would have been met by the martyrs, who next took up the hue and cry, with stony incredulity. The sand of the arena becomes, for the martyr, a battlefield on which he engages the hosts of the Evil One, as personified by the θηρίοι (and who can gainsay their fearful reality!). Such foreboding prospects prompt austerity and disciplined service. Hence Ignatius urges Polycarp:

> Be pleasing to him in whose ranks you serve, from whom you receive your pay,--let none of you be found a deserter. Let your baptism remain as your arms, your faith as a helmet, your love as a spear, your endurance as your panoply, let your works be your deposits that you may receive the back-pay due to you (6.2).

The mantel worn by the early Christian martyrs fell next on the monks, who took up the war, though it was in their case directed (though not exclusively) against unearthly foes; i.e., the demons. St. Antony is,

---

[54] History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient (Louvain: Secretariat du Corpus SCO, 1958), Volume I, 14. Cf. Harnack, 5:

> In den orientalischen Kirchen sind das Volkstum [event. auch der Staat] und die Religion wieder so zusammengewachsen, dass in Fällen der Not der heilige Krieg proklamiert wird, um mit dem Volkstum den 'Nationalgott' zu verteidigen.

of course, the most illustrious example. According to Hans Lietzmann, Athanasius was but reflecting popular opinion when he maintained that Antony's

> increasingly severe acts of self-denial provoked the demons; and that, by going into the waste places and the deserts, he invaded their special preserves, and challenged them to battle to the death. He wrestled not only with those temptations which were due to the passions of the flesh, but more particularly, with a thousand forms of physical torment; and it was his victories over those assailants and these difficulties that made him the 'perfect' ascetic.[55]

---

[55] A History of the Early Church, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: World Publishing Company, r.p., 1964), Volume IV, 135. See St. Athanasius, The Life of St. Antony, translated by Robert T. Meyer (Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950), 21, 51-53. It is interesting that, in Antony's address to the monks, he connects this fighting with the Day of Judgment idea (19). Cf. also Louis Bouyer, The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers, translated by Mary P. Ryan (New York: Desclee Company, 1963), 311ff; George Williams, 38ff and Jean Steinmann, Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition (New York; Harper and Brothers, 1958), 165-168. Harnack, 6 and 93ff, cites, in an appendix, a great number of relevant texts from the Fathers, wherein the Militia Christi motif is sounded: Clement of Rome, Polycarp, Hermas, Justin, the Acts of Paul, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Novatian, Commodian, Pseudo-Cyprian, Lactantius, Arnobius and Eusebius. On the Acts of Paul he says: "Dem irdischen Könige steht der himmlische König Christus gegenüber, und die Christen sind ausschliesslich Soldaten dieses himmlischen Königs (23). When one recalls that such emphases were not limited to the Christian world, their popularity becomes apparent. The Mithraic faith certainly embodied similar motifs. Franz Cumont describes it as follows: "Life is a combat; soldiers under the command of Mithra, invincible heroes of the faith, must ceaselessly oppose the undertakings of the infernal powers which sow corruption broadcast" (The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism [New York, 1956], 199).

CHAPTER III

THE SYNOPTIC TRADITION AND HOLY WAR

What has the preceding to do with the New Testament? In answer to this question, let us first say that it has been our concern to show how persistently the ancient ideas of Holy War had become attached to sundry cultures. We are consequently led to inquire as to why, in view of such weighty historical precedents which blanketed New Testament times we find a comparative dearth of such ideology in the literature of the New Testament. We insist that such a dearth exists in spite of the fact that we have already surveyed the martial terminology found therein and have indicated a considerable body of material. The purpose of the survey, as will become clearer, was to throw into relief the fact that while there was an abundance of raw materials from which to refine a theology of Holy War, such a theology was only spasmodically constructed.

It is the view of this writer (and this represents one of the major reasons for the production of this work) that the prospects for greater elucidation of the New Testament materials have been appreciably hampered by the

reign of certain imprecise methodologies. More precisely, the überlieferungsgeschichtliche approach,[1] to which this author subscribes, would, as concerns the matter of Holy War theology, apply that description only to such literature which faithfully echoes a majority of the traditional themes. Such precision assumes a thorough application of the exegetical and linguistic tasks. As this relates more specifically to the present problem, far too much of the New Testament language of conflict has been subsumed under Holy War ideology proper[2] (though such is doubtless true of the literature contemporary with the New Testament as well). It is, of course, quite obvious that the New Testament provides ample illustration of ideas of conflict and

---

[1] As worked out, supremely, in the writings of Martin Noth and Gerhard von Rad. The usual English rendition is "history of traditions" approach.

[2] The author finds himself in substantial agreement with Ernest Best, The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology (Cambridge: University Press, 1965), in his plea for precision in this area. He caveats against those (e.g., James Kallas, U.W. Mauser and J.M. Robinson) who too easily read a particular theory of conflict into the narratives; for example, against Kallas, The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles (London: SPCK, 1961) he says: "He works throughout with an uncritical view of the Gospels" (23). This is not to imply that our conclusions will be wholly dissimilar to some of those arrived at by Kallas, Mauser et al.; we feel, however, that the present approach will afford a more defensible basis for such claims.

victory, as Ragnar Leivestad has so ably demonstrated.[3] To describe these strife-metaphors as battles of a kind is certainly warranted, but the designation "Holy War" ought to be retained for specialized, technical applications, for literature wherein the old familiar imagery recurs. Our insistence on this point is not mere caprice; rather, we intend to show that the tracing of the old motifs through the literature of the New Testament will enable us to illuminate its central message; it will provide us with a compact statement of its theological emphases. So that, to the question of the reason for the martial nuances present in the New Testament, we must reply that it was the widespread notions of warfare which bequeathed their tendencies to it. But, from a literary point of view, ordinary military imagery and Holy Warfare are two separate entities; the latter congeries of belief must be isolated so that what is uniquely the Hebrew (and Christian) contribution to the formulations of faith may be thrown into relief.[4]

---

[3] Conqueror. See also Gerald Bonner, The Warfare of Christ (London: Faith Press, 1962); Heinrich Schlier, Principalities and Powers in the New Testament (New York: Herder and Herder, 1961); Anton Fridrichsen, "The Conflict of Jesus with the Unclean Spirits," Theology 22 (1931), 122-135; C. D. Morrison, The Powers That Be (Naperville: Alec R. Allenson Inc., 1960) and the previously mentioned works of Harnack and Windisch.

[4] One is reminded of von Rad's view that it is in the holy wars that the demand for faith in Yahweh had its roots (Theology I, 17). Cf. Miller, 45, 46 and Claus

The Passion Narratives. Where, then, to begin? It would seem that, for purposes of following a logical theological development, one ought to focus first on what is commonly felt to be determinative for the key theological emphases of the New Testament: the Passion of Jesus, as represented by the Synoptists. Our aim at this point is to substantiate this and to contribute at least a partial solution to the problem posed by Leivestad:

> Christ's death and resurrection are nowhere explicitly interpreted as a triumph over the devil, death, or cosmic powers. But we may arrive at more positive conclusions if we look for indirect evidence of the view that his death is the crowning fulfilment, the glorious consummation of his mission (63,4) (italics mine).

We will largely employ the Matthean account, as it offers most promise of demonstrating our hypothesis. At the outset, one needs to be apprised of the militaristic atmosphere which pervades the account of the crucifixion and resurrection; one needs but to glance at the number of occasions when soldiers appear on the scene (27.27-31,54,65,66; 28.3,11,12).[5] This is not to suggest

---

Westermann, who echoes von Rad's thesis ("The Way of the Promise Through the Old Testament" in Bernhard W. Anderson (ed.), The Old Testament and Christian Faith: Essays by Rudolf Bultmann and others [London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964], 204,205,216.

[5]This relatively high incidence of references to the military appears to be a bit out of character for Matthew, as he is not otherwise nearly as concerned with martial matters, as is Luke, who in the passion narrative adverts less frequently to the presence of the soldiery.

that the military did not play a part in these proceedings;[6] indeed, there is probably an authentic core to this emphasis. It could very well be that the memory of the soldiers' presence helped suggest to the evangelist the possibility of treating these events in the light of a Holy War.

It is also possible that the event which commenced the activities of Passion Week, the entry into Jerusalem (21), had been indelibly etched in the author's mind and facilitated such treatment. For various aspects of that entry evidently impressed the throng with the possibility that here was a conqueror coming to reclaim the city. It seems that Jesus, in this act, is made to pattern his actions after Zechariah's description of the warrior-like מלך:

> Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion!
> Shout aloud, O daughter of Jerusalem!
> Lo, your king[7] comes to you;
> triumphant and victorious is he,
> humble and riding on an ass,
> on a colt the foal of an ass (9.9).

But not completely so. Matthew omits Zechariah's line as to the triumphant and victorious nature of the

---

[6]For instance, R. Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964), 493, considers the arrest by Roman soldiers to be historically correct.

[7]It is significant that Jesus, whether in derision or sincerity, is several times referred to as βασιλεύς in the Passion history (27.11; 29,37,42).

entry. Also, what this auspicious debut implies for the enemies of the people, as pictured by Zechariah, is considerably toned down by Matthew, though the cleansing of the temple (21.12,13) may be meant to correspond to the prophecy.[8] So that, while Matthew emphasizes the humble

---

[8]However, the cutting and the spreading of the branches in the way (8) may be a subtle indication of the fervid expectations of the rabble. John (12.13) specifies these branches as palm branches. On this see W.R. Farmer, "The Palm Branches in John 12.13," Journal of Theological Studies N.S. 3 (1952), 65:

> If we consider the possibility that St. John has preserved an historical fact, omitted by the synoptists, the presence of palm branches would seem to indicate that there may well have been within the rejoicing crowd those who looked to Jesus as one who, following in the footsteps of the Maccabees, would lead the nation to victory in its struggle to throw off the 'yoke of the heathen' and reassert the sovereignty of God over Israel.

Bultmann terms the account of the Entry "legendary", since "the assumption that has to be made if we are to take the story as history, the assumption namely, that Jesus intended to fulfil the prophecy in Zechariah 9.9 and that the crowd recognized the ass as the Messiah's beast of burden is absurd" (History of the Synoptic Tradition, translated by John Marsh [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963], 261,262). For our purposes the question of historical validity is tangential. What is important is that the event was conceived of along the lines of the Matthean interpretation. This leads us to say that the form-critical and history-of-traditions approaches are equally valid and can supplement each other. If it is the task of the history-of-traditions approach to isolate the traditions, it is the task of form-criticism to describe the community which perpetuated them. The exclusive use of the history-of-traditions method should not meet with the kind of castigation which Philipp Vielhauer heaps on Ferdinand Hahn's monograph (Christologische Hoheitstitel); he accuses Hahn of attempting to write a history of traditions while overleaping the task of form-criticism (Theologische Literaturzeitung 90 [1965], 569-588, especially Column 586). While it is true that the former is a specialized outgrowth of the latter, it has yet to be demonstrated to this writer that the fulfilment of the

aspects of the entry as much as the exalted, enough of the latter remain to suggest the arrival of a "messianic" figure. For, indeed, the crowd exultingly acclaims him to be the Son of David, the nationalistic hero who would come to set his people free and to inaugurate a reign of peace.[9] To effect such a reign would have involved a war (Holy War?); the opportunity is not seized--possibly due to Jesus' unorthodox views regarding that figure. At any rate, the implications of that event seem to have set the tone for the narration of the subsequent events of that week.

One who goes beyond a perusal of mere martial language in an attempt to discover the traditional Holy War motifs will not be disappointed. After the manner of a warrior, it may be said, Jesus goes forth to engage the enemy.

First, however, Jesus must prepare himself ritually and morally. The partaking of the passover meal can be viewed as a cultic act of dedication and preparation

---

form-critical task is requisite to the use of the other method. Indeed, perhaps the converse is true. At any rate, the two methodologies are to be thought of as subsisting, not in a filial, but in a fraternal relationship to each other.

[9]The Synoptic parallels are here of interest. While Mark's version of the cry reads: "Blessed be the coming kingdom of our Father David, Luke has it: "Blessed be the king who comes in the name of the Lord. Regal associations are obvious in this case. On this matter see Farmer, Maccabees, 199,200.

for the imminent conflict. The tryst in Gethsemane represents the continuation of this necessary disciplined consecration, since this is the time of πείρασμος (26.41). The term πείρασμος

> has its roots in the imagery of a state of war between two powers in the world, that of God and that of Satan, in which the believer, as God's soldier, is constantly exposed to the attacks of the devil and must therefore be watchful and armed at his post.[10]

Humanly speaking, the upcoming strife would prompt desperation and despair; as in days of old, the will of the divine must be consulted: "My father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt" (39). Echoing once more a familiar theme, though the outcome of the battle is determined by God himself, faith and acquiescence in the divine will are taken to be necessary. Only then is the warrior able to bestir himself, sound the battle-cry, and advance to the front: ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν· ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ὁ παραδιδούς με (46).

Just prior to this Jesus says (45): ἰδοὺ ἤγγικεν ἡ ὥρα, similar in form to what was evidently an ancient

---

[10]Karl Georg Kuhn, "New Light on Temptation, Sin and Flesh in the New Testament" in Krister Stendahl (ed.), The Scrolls and the New Testament (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), 96. See also his judicious comments, in a similar vein, in "Jesus in Gethsemane," Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952), 260-285, particularly page 283. Cf. Eduard Lohse, Die Geschichte des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu Christi (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1964), 61-63.

war-cry: "The Day of the Lord is near."[11] The first hint that the ancient traditions will here be refracted comes in the words: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλῶν(45). In the old stories a standard motif was Yahweh's assurance that he had given the enemy into Israel's hand; e.g., Judges 8.3 (LXX): ἐν χειρὶ ὑμῶν παρέδωκεν κύριος τοὺς ἄρχοντας Μαδιαμ, τὸν Ωρηβ καὶ τὸν Ζηβ. In Matthew's version of the Passion history as Holy War, the tables are thus turned against God's own. For God smites (παταίξω) the shepherd (26.31), which could obviously refer only to Jesus. One should at this point, however, not forget the similar heresy often promulgated by the prophets (and Josephus?).

Throughout this period of making ready, stress is laid on the disciples' lack of preparedness. Peter will deny his master (33-35); he is in this respect but representative of the twelve, who will all "fall away" (σκανδαλισθήσεσθε) that night (31).[12] The "inner three" cannot maintain the necessary vigil; they fall asleep at the post (40,43,45). As a result, the combatant must

---

[11] See von Rad, Theology II, 124.

[12] That Matthew has war in mind here is substantiated by the source of the quotation (Zechariah 13.7), for it is the sword which scatters the sheep.

enter the fray by himself.[13] As in the days of Gideon, so now the undesirables and the unfit have been weeded out. Eventually the disciples bear out the truth of Jesus' prediction: τότε οἱ μαθηταὶ πάντες ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἔφυγον (56).

The next point at which the resemblances to the old ideas are apparent is in the description of the crucifixion. In the first place, it is instructive to note that the cross is raised on a hill, Golgotha. This is reminiscent of the days when Israel was summoned to war, oftentimes by the raising of a signal on a hill:[14]

> On a bare hill raise a signal, cry aloud to them;
> wave the hand for them to enter the gates of the nobles.
> I myself have commanded my consecrated ones,
> have summoned my mighty men to execute my anger,
> my proudly exulting ones.
> Hark, a tumult on the mountains[15] as of a great multitude!
> Hark, an uproar of kingdoms, of nations gathering together!
> The Lord of hosts is mustering a host for battle
> (Isaiah 13.2-4).

---

[13] In the old days two enemy forces would occasionally agree to settle an issue by single combat; see I Samuel 17.4,8-10,23; II Samuel 2.14f; 21.15-21.

[14] This is perhaps provided here by the inscription over Jesus' head: "This is Jesus the <u>King</u> of the Jews."

[15] The next lines would be paralleled by the throng assembled on Golgotha to witness the execution. When one recalls that this was Passover week, the presence of a multitude of people in Jerusalem at this time is indeed likely. One might further note that several motifs in Isaiah 13 (e.g., prodigies, fear) are reproduced in the Matthean Passion narrative.

Furthermore, in keeping with proper military decorum, Jesus spurns the drink proffered him (34), thus demonstrating the gravity of the hour by his abstention from anything which might debilitate him.[16]

While Jesus is on the cross, the apparent victors in this war engage in the distribution of the spoils, the garments (35). Though again, as was true of the offer of drink, it seems that this was a customary practice, one should not overlook the significance in Matthew's reporting of this, for it enhances the total impression of the scene as one of war.

As he is about to succumb, the crucified cries out: ἠλὶ ἠλὶ λεμὰ σαβαχθάνι. This could perhaps be thought of in terms of another war-cry; this impression is strengthened as one notes the fact that Jesus is said to have cried in a loud voice (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ). It seems a bit unnatural to expect a loud cry from one in Jesus' weakened condition; perhaps we are here again to think of the loud war-cries which punctuated the battles of antiquity.[17]

---

[16]Whether the immediate reason for the refusal was due to the nauseous taste of the mixture or because, as some commentators opine, he wished to taste the dregs deeply, is not here to the point; the symbolism is, in any case, perceptible.

[17]However, it should be said that Luke's version of the last words bears greater resemblance to a war-cry: "Father, into thy hands I commit my spirit" (23.46). This cry Matthew chooses to report in narrative form (27.50).

That this is the case is proved as one notes that immediately after the cry goes forth, various prodigies occur, attending the course of the war. The familiar portents and miracles are witnessed once more: darkness covers the earth (45),[18] the temple-veil is rent asunder (51), the earth shakes (51), rocks are split (51) and death surrenders its hold on πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων (52,53).

Next, one hears that the centurion and those with him who were guarding Jesus, having witnessed the earthquake and the other unnatural phenomena, were filled with awe (ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα) (27.54). The fact that it is precisely stated that the soldiers feared greatly is significant; it reminds one of the consternation and panic Yahweh's might caused in the camp of the enemy, in the records of Israelite Holy War. The soldiers' response is also recorded by Matthew: ἀληθῶς θεοῦ υἱὸς ἦν οὗτος (27.54).

Pausing for a moment, the preceeding language is

---

[18] However, this occurs before Jesus' death-cry. According to Leivestad's explanation (75)

> The supernatural darkness that covered the whole land does not symbolize cosmic lamentation or the feeling of being forsaken, but together with the torn curtain of the temple it is rather a symbol of the wrath of God and his judgment on the people and the Jewish sanctuary.

If one adopts this interpretation it follows that in this war God is turning once more against his own nation, as he was portrayed as doing in Amos, and as he would summarily do forty years later.

strikingly similar to one of the Holy Wars described in the Septuagintal text of I Samuel 4 (though Israel was defeated in that particular instance). The arrival of the ark of the covenant of the Lord in the camp suggests for Israel the presence of Yahweh himself. Consequently, and prior to setting out to war, all Israel gives a mighty shout (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) (4.5). The result is that the Philistines are terrified (ἐφοβήθησαν). The clamor prompts the following verdict on their part: Οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ ἥκασιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν (4.7).

Matthew's description of the resurrection continues along similar lines.[19] Another earthquake occurs (28.2). Though the introductory γὰρ in the second clause of verse two is problematical, in that it is difficult to see just how the earthquake was caused by the descent of the angel, the fact that one finds here an angelophany is not without importance, for in II Kings 19, it was the angel of the Lord who slew 185,000 Assyrians. Furthermore, the dazzling appearance of the angel in Matthew 28 causes fear: ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ φόβου αὐτοῦ ἐσείσθησαν οἱ τη - ροῦντες καὶ ἐγενήθησαν ὡς νεκροί (28.4).

If this be regarded as sufficient assessment of

---

[19] In Joshua 8.29 the king of Ai was hanged on a tree until evening (cf. Matthew 27.59); his body was then taken down, cast at the entrance of the gate of the city, and a heap of stones raised over it. In Joshua 10 the five kings of the opposition are sealed in a cave by rolling great stones against its mouth and a guard is set.

the Passion, as narrated by Matthew, let it be immediately acknowledged that this is a strange and unprecedented Holy War. In the first place, it is not God himself who wars directly, rather Jesus.[20] Again, the old descriptive imagery surrounding the Holy War is now employed to describe a passive act of submission to the enemy, a passivity which would have been a most heretical way to prosecute a war for Holy Warriors of the old school. It is, notwithstanding this note of despair, true that the resurrection represents a victory, but it is a victory which takes place in the face of death.[21] Beyond that, one has only to reflect on the opprobrium which attached to death via the cross in those days. A strange Holy War indeed![22]

---

[20]Though for the early Christian there was ostensibly no difference between the two, since Jesus was regarded as divine. The very fact that he wages war in God's stead implies this assumption. It should, however, be pointed out that there is in the account an emphasis on Jesus' reliance upon the Father (26.39,42,53; 27.43,46), suggesting that it is indeed God himself who is in charge of these operations.

[21]Fridrichsen, 134, says:

> The Gospel tradition presents us with a continual balance of actio and passio in the life [and we would add the death] of Jesus. He is the object of temptations and trials [πειρασμοί] on the part of the Devil and his hosts, and finally he gives himself up, unresisting, into the hands of sinners, to be ill-treated, mocked, put to death. But he it is who also repels the attacks by God's word and his own irresistible wisdom [and we would add by his resurrection].

[22]Jesus is said to have refused to engage in the kind of traditional Holy War which would have cleared him (26.52,53). See G.R. Beasley-Murray, A Commentary on Mark Thirteen (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1957),

Perhaps the tension which resulted from the Evangelist's awareness of the immense popularity of Holy War concepts and his equal awareness of the scandalous nature of Jesus' death is responsible for a certain reserve, a reticence in explaining the death and resurrection of Jesus wholly in the traditional terms of a Holy War. For these events simply do not fit the old categories. However, enough of the familiar strains are introduced so that the intention of the Synoptists can be gauged.

Some may object that while many of the constituent elements of the Holy War tradition are preserved in the Synoptic portrayal of the death and resurrection, a crucial aspect of that tradition is patently not visible;

---

34. Instead, Jesus fights his own brand of war and thus further scandalizes the expectations of his followers, who failed to understand this strange resignation. This, of course, raises the question of the propriety of designating Jesus' strife as a Holy War; it must be said, notwithstanding, that, in view of a host of affinities, the attempt to interpret it along those lines is certainly in evidence.

that is, these events are not explicitly cast by the Synoptic tradition in the form of a war. It is, however, a fact that in some early Christian circles Jesus' death and resurrection was viewed as a battle[23] in which God successfully engages the enemy. Relevant texts are: I Corinthians 2.8; 15.24,25; Colossians 1.16; Hebrews 2.14; 12.3,4; I Peter 3.22; I John 3.8 and Colossians 2.15, where the opposition is represented by the ἀρχάς and the ἐξουσίας.[24] These verses demonstrate that the interpretation of the Passion as a war was at least in the air in those days; this fact, taken with the traditional motifs which are utilized by the Synoptists to describe that

---

[23]Gustaf Aulen's work (Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement, translated by A. G. Hebert (London: SPCK, r.p., 1953) is, of course, of more than passing interest at this point. For every New Testament description of the atonement in terms of a battle, one can multiply examples in the Fathers. For Irenaeus, for instance, " . . . the earthly life of Christ as a whole is thus regarded as a continuous process of victorious conflict," but "it is His death that is the final and decisive battle" (46). Cf. John Lawson, The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus (London: Epworth Press, 1948), 144-150, on the "Christus Victor" theme in Irenaeus.

[24]Thus, G. H. C. MacGregor, "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies 1 (1954), 24:

> In short, just as Jesus, contemplating the results of his mission, cried out, 'I saw Satan fallen like lightning from heaven,' so does Paul see the 'principalities and powers' routed by the cross, even though final cosmic victory is to come only at the Parousia.

For an equally salient view, see G. B. Caird, Principalities and Powers (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956), 92.

event justifies one's taking it as still another Holy War.[25]

Though the foe is not explicitly designated in the Passion narratives,[26] it would appear that the ἄνθρωποι ἁμαρτωλοί (Luke 24.7) who carry out the crucifixion are in a sense conceived of as the opposition.[27] It seems that this earthly foe is mythologized into the "powers and principalities" in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline literature. This ambiguity would indicate that while the fact of the battle itself is a constant, the foe referred to is a variable. The emphasis is on the actual waging of

---

[25]In Leivestad's words (72), "Luke, in particular, makes it clear that the passion means a πειρασμός, an ordeal and a temptation." See Luke 22.3,28,31,39-46,53; 24.7. Cf. Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, translated by Geoffrey Buswell (London: Faber and Faber, 1961), 16:

> When Jesus was alive, was the time of salvation; Satan was far away, it was a time without temptation . . . [on the basis of Luke 4.13]. Since the Passion, however, Satan is present again and the disciples of Jesus are again subject to temptation [22.36].

One must here keep in mind the warlike imagery which lies in the background of this πειρασμός (supra, 54).

[26]One frequently hears the crucifixion and resurrection explained in terms of a war between Jesus and the Evil One. However, the Synoptic Passion accounts do not so much as mention the latter.

[27]This impression is enhanced when one recalls Peter's bitter polemic against the Jews; they killed him (Acts 3.15; 4.10). See also Luke 23.51, where Joseph is described as not having consented to their purpose and deed (οὗτος οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν). Who αὐτῶν refers to is not explicitly related; however, the preceding βουλευτής (50) suggests itself as the antecedent and the Sanhedrin is, in that event, portrayed as the foe.

the war. In any event, we would agree with Otto Betz:

> Denn zum Wirken Jesu gehört neben dem heiligen Krieg gegen den Einen der heilige Dienst für die Vielen, und nach der Deutung der ersten Zeugen ist die Krönung des heiligen priestlichen Diensts das Kreuz, an dem Jesus sich selbst als Opfer darbringt, und der Sieg über die Macht der Finsternis und des Todes ist die Auferstehung.[28]

The Exorcism Narratives. Passing now to a discussion of the way in which the life of Jesus is described by the Evangelists, one can say at the outset that in view of, on the one hand, the glorious victory which was felt to have been won in the death and resurrection with its warfare terminology and, on the other hand, the antagonism which Jesus' ministry provoked, it is understandable that metaphors of conflict abound in the Gospels.

We would, nonetheless, introduce a preliminary caveat. To speak of Jesus, in his life's work, as a Holy Warrior waging a Holy War is, in the strict sense, inaccurate. It is perfectly obvious that he carries the fight

---

[28] P. 135. See also William Manson, "Principalities and Powers: The Spiritual Background of the Work of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels," Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas 3 (1952), 14,15:

> From the Pauline, and indeed from the whole New Testament standpoint, when the Christ bowed his head on the cross, all the powers of darkness, all the demonism of the cosmos, affronted Him and closed with Him im mortal combat.

to the demons[29] (and consequently Satan), but the fact of the matter is that the familiar imagery attending the Holy War concept is almost wholly lacking in the accounts of these conflicts.[30]

For purposes of illustrating the fierce conflict we will briefly evaluate the exorcism narratives, since they present this conflict in its most graphic form.[31] It is Mark who most delights in depicting the exorcisms in heightened fashion, so that the essential nature of the

---

[29]Hans Bietenhard succinctly sums up this view: "Jesus hatte sein Wirken auf Erden verstanden auch als einen Kampf gegen den Satan und seinen Anhang von Dämonen und bösen Geistern" (Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum Tübingen: Verlag J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1951 , 212).

[30]This Norman Perrin's acuity enables him to see. He rightfully distinguishes between the Holy War imagery found in Qumran and the exorcismal battles of the Gospels (The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963 , 171):

> The exorcisms [Jesus'] are the signs of victory in the decisive battle against the power of Satan, as the exorcisms of the disciples are also a sign of the overthrow of the arch-enemy. . . . This is markedly parallel to the situation envisaged in the Qumran War Scroll, except that what is there expressed in the imagery of a holy war is here to be found in terms of demon possession and exorcism.

[31]The facility with which the idea of war is projected onto the crises in the life of Jesus is remarkable. According to some, he seems to war every waking minute against both disease and nature (So Leivestad, 42; Paul J. Achtemeier, "Person and Deed: Jesus and the Storm-Tossed Sea," Interpretation 16 1962 , 176 and James Kallas, 63, 65,79. For a needed antidote, see Betz, 134, who makes the salutary point that Jesus does not fight against the powers, but the Power. The diseased, the possessed and the sinful cannot be said to be Jesus' enemies. This is all too easily forgotten.

fierce conflict becomes visible.[32] This viciousness is aptly seen in 1.23-26, where in response to the uproarious cry of the man with the unclean spirit, Jesus found it necessary to "rebuke (ἐπετίμησεν) him": φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἐξ αὐτοῦ (25). The spirit obeys, but its exit is tumultuous and torturous: it both σπαράξαν the man and φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ (26).

Jesus' authority to cast out demons comes into question in chapter three. To the charge that he exorcizes by the prince of demons Jesus rejoins with a reductio ad absurdum. Regardless of the convincing power of the argument, the point is that the exorcisms represent a binding of the strong man (ἰσχυρός).[33]

In 9.17-29 one finds a garrulous account, describing the inability of the disciples to cure the young demoniac. This inability, coupled with the emphasis on the terrible power of the spirit, the grotesque effects

---

[32] James M. Robinson, The Problem of History in Mark (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957), 36:

> The clear-cut antithesis between the principals in the exorcism narratives is accentuated by the hostile atmosphere in which their discussions take place. We do not find calm conversations, but shouts and orders.

[33] Leivestad, 46, says:

> The devil is ἰσχυρός, but Jesus is ἰσχυρότερος. . . . It is certainly Jesus, not God, who is regarded as the conqueror. That Jesus has come with authority to bind the devil is the all-important news which heralds the change of ages.

The military nature of this confrontation is limpidly set forth in Luke's version (11.21,22).

of which are four times described in macabre detail (18, 20,22,26), serves to throw into relief the supernatural power of Jesus, who alone is capable of subduing chthonic forces.

So that, while we have seen that there is an element of conflict (indeed, furious conflict) in the exorcism narratives, one should not dignify this conflict to the point where it is designated Holy War.[34] Aside from the fact that many of the necessary component parts of the archaic traditions are missing, the outcome is, in any event, a foregone conclusion in each case. Far from representing an actual war, the exorcisms simply provide opportunities for the ἰσχυρότερος to vaunt his might.[35] Thus it is clear that the necessary elements for the elaboration of Holy War theology were at hand; the fact, however, that they were not so assimilated cannot be denied.

---

[34] As Betz is too wont to do.

[35] Ernest Best, 20, maintains that

> . . . in his actual discussion of the exorcism narratives Robinson [J. M.] lays too much stress on the element of struggle; we have sought alternatively to show that on each occasion Jesus is from beginning to end the master, though the demon may attempt to struggle, and he is master because he has defeated already the demon's own master, Satan.

See also G. E. Ladd, Jesus and the Kingdom (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964), 157: "In the conflict motif between Satan and the Kingdom of God, God is the aggressor; Satan is on the defensive. . . . Whenever Jesus speaks of the conflict with Satan and his demons, it is always in terms of their defeat." This is quite dissimilar from Israelite Holy Wars, which at times issued in defeat for Yahweh's people.

The Question of Zealotic Influence. A look at the New Testament environment will aid in defining the problem which the previous discussion uncovered. Specifically, it is apparent that Jesus' contemporary world was in a perpetual state of upheaval because of the furtive stirrings of the Zealots. The Roman heel cannot be said to have been inordinately heavy; indeed, Herod and his fellows could and did from time to time exercise a benign influence. This fact, however, struck a deaf note with those intense patriots who, chafing at the bit, recalled the glorious theocracy of their ancestors. The Zealot, the one who is קנא (which lies behind ζηλόω), is jealous for the righteous manifestation of God's rule and is zealous in his efforts to see that end attained.[36] Thus, he views himself as justified in taking matters into his own hands and forcing the hand of the divine. Fundamentally, what is at stake here is the question of theodicy; how can God, the same God who has continually interposed in behalf of his people, be justified in his present quietism?[37]

As we intimated in the introductory survey, the relative abundance of martial language in the portrait of

---

[36] See Farmer, 178.

[37] This is the primary question which plagues the apocalyptists as well; this fact should not be overlooked when broaching the matter of relationships between the two circles.

Jesus would argue for a kind of Zealotic influence. As a matter of fact, we have several indications of the continual proximity of Zealotism to Jesus; it seems always to lurk in the background of the Synoptic tradition. Thus Cullmann, beginning with an arbitrary conclusion, maintains that

> Jesus was no Zealot.[38] But the historians have thrown out the baby with the bath. They have not paid attention to the fact that Jesus' whole ministry was in continuous contact with Zealotism, that this formed the background, so to speak, of his activity, and that he was executed as a Zealot.[39]

Among the facts, rather well-known, are these. Apparently some of the disciples were Zealots; indeed, one

---

[38]This is equally as arbitrary as R. Eisler's thesis of Jesus as a Zealot (Ἰησοῦς βασιλεὺς οὐ βασιλεύσας--not accessible to me). Both views assume that our information, on the basis of the Synoptic materials, is adequate enough to permit the formulation of such views, a shaky assumption indeed. A more plausible view is put forth by James C.G. Greig, "The Eschatological Ministry" in Hugh Anderson and William Barclay (eds.), The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G.H.C. Macgregor (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965), 111: "We deduce, then, that Jesus and his closest followers were not identical with what came to be known as the Zealot party, but were attractive to individual Zealots and did not in turn rebuff them." He chooses to describe Jesus as a "'Fabian' nationalist"; however, this would not necessarily imply that he would never act, but simply that he would await the best opportunity and make no hasty move. For him the best opportunity could easily be an act of God to be anticipated by a correct reading of the signs of the times.

[39]P. 49. Cf. Ellis E. Jensen, "The First Century Controversy over Jesus as a Revolutionary Figure," The Journal of Biblical Literature 60 (1941), 261-272, who avers: "Every study of the life of Jesus should give close attention to his activity in the midst of these revolutionary longings and outbreaks" (262).

is named Simon the Ζηλωτήν (Luke 6.15; Acts 1.13).[40] It is also possible that "Iscariot" is to be interpreted along these lines, as may "Bar Jona". It is clear that the sons of Zebedee share the Zealotic mentality; Jesus' name for them (Βοανηργές, ὅ ἐστιν υἱοὶ βροντῆς)[41] is enlightening. Cullmann's conclusion seems warranted: "One of the Twelve--Simon the Zealot--certainly belonged to the Zealots; others probably did, like Judas Iscariot, Peter and possibly the sons of Zebedee."[42] Add to this the fact that Jesus was crucified as a "Zealot",[43] one who disturbed the Pax Romana, and one gains the impression that Jesus was constantly exposed to a Zealotic frame of mind, if not to actual Zealots.

In view of this proximity of Zealotism to the framers of the Synoptic record, one wonders why Jesus is not made to take up the challenge of a Holy War much more explicitly than is the case. Instead, he repeatedly

---

[40]Simon is designated τὸν Κανανταῖον in Mark 3.18, which Cullmann (15) contends has nothing to do with the land of Canaan, but is simply a transcription of the Aramaic designation for Zealots.

[41]Mark 3.17. See also 10.37 and Luke 9.54 for events which support this impression.

[42]P. 17.

[43]Jensen, 262,264, notes that Jesus was arrested as a λῃστής, "robber", a word meaning "revolutionary" or "insurrectionist" rather than an ordinary thief.

disavows those aims which were set forth by the Zealots (e.g., Matthew 16.23).[44] However, this is not to deny the existence of a number of motifs in the Gospel tradition which were certainly congenial to the Zealotic mind; they may possibly represent the vestiges of an originally more impressive part of the Synoptic tradition. This possibility leads one to ask whether the warlike elements were part of the original tradition, with later attempts made to temper them or whether they are secondary (and tertiary) attempts to align Jesus more closely with the Zealotic cause.[45] A more acute form of the question would be: Was Jesus himself a Zealot or is he mistakenly pictured as sharing some of their propensities by the traditions? Again, if the later tradition interpreted him in this way, was it primarily the original or the secondary levels which did so?

A cursory analysis of the materials seems to indicate that while Jesus broke with notions of militant

---

[44]This is particularly true in the Passion History (Matthew 26.51-53 and the docility of spirit Jesus there displays).

[45]Windisch, 43, states these alternatives in lucid fashion:

> Für ihr verständnis [the warlike elements] sind zwei Möglichkeiten gegeben. Entweder stellen sie eine ursprüngliche Überlieferung dar, die in diesen spärlichen, aber doch noch immer erkennbaren Resten durch die spätere Übermalung durchdringt. Oder sie sind im Zusammenhang mit der sonstigen Gesamtüberlieferung auslegbar.

Messianism,[46] some circles in early Christianity ("Christian Zealots"?) viewed him as a Zealot, which view the later molders of the record (the evangelists?) were at pains to tone down.[47] Simply to obliterate all traces of such views would have been to play fast and loose with what was undoubtedly already assuming the form of a written, authoritative body of tradition. Consequently, a mediating tack was pursued.

At any rate, the important question concerns the undeniable presence of Zealotically-tinged remains in the Synoptic corpus. They certainly represent heuristic value; why were these raw materials not refined and utilized in the formulation of a thorough-going theology of Holy War?[48]

---

[46]See O. Michel, "Krieg III. Im NT.," Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (Tubingen: J.C.B. Mohr Paul Siebeck , 1960), Volume IV, 66, who, though his conclusions seem based on a rather uncritical use of the sources, agrees substantially with the view here suggested:

> In der Sendung Jesu liegt eine klare Absage an den Zelotismus und eine Warnung vor dem kommenden Unheil, das auf Jerusalem zukommt Mark 13.1,2; Luke 13.34; 23.28-31 . Die Möglichkeit eines hl. K. es im Sinne der apokalyptischen Tradition ist bei Jesus nicht gegeben. Man hat sich auch später nicht in die Aufstände hineinziehen lassen, sondern ihre Führer und Folgen abgelehnt Mark 13.14-23 .

[47]Jensen, 264, substantially agrees with this.

[48]By "thorough-going" we mean a consistent and extensive application of the customary motifs to the various facets of the life of Jesus. We have already demonstrated, however, that even the exorcism narratives do not receive such treatment. Thus, it is at least logical that the rest of his life is not so cast.

To answer this question one can, in the first place, refer to the historical setting. If any religion in early Christian times were desirous of acquiring religio licita status, its teaching had of necessity to be largely devoid of offensive features. Talk of a Holy War would certainly have done nothing to ease an explosive situation. Indeed, some of the primitive representations of Jesus may have tended to confirm the Roman suspicions of Jesus as a Zealot; further development along those lines could have had grievous consequences.

Furthermore, there may have developed a considerable disenchantment with such ideas among the Christian community after the Jewish debacle in 70 AD, though one ought not to press the importance of this to the lengths of S.G.F. Brandon's thesis.[49] Specifically, this event may have expedited a certain expurgation of offensive elements within the tradition, which if retained, might have served to hint at another uprising.

We must not, while discussing possible explanations for the absence of a full-orbed treatment of Jesus' life as a Holy War, neglect to mention the possibility that Jesus' own teachings may have proven influential here. It is, however, agreed that these are not fully recoverable. Beyond that, the question of Jesus'

---

[49] The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church (London: SPCK, 1961).

influence is related to the previous suggestions insofar as it is a historical issue. We are concerned, in discussing the theology of Holy War, primarily with literary phenomena, from which any problems which might arise would seem to demand literary solutions. While historical suggestions may here represent preliminary answers, we feel that the real explanation lies elsewhere.

The major reason for the failure to interpret Jesus as a Zealot has already been indicated in the demonstration that the technical language of Holy War is focused by the Synoptists almost exclusively on the events of the Passion. It was their conviction that in his death and resurrection Jesus did battle with the enemy; any subsequent attempts to portray his life in terms of a traditional Holy War would have been largely gratuitous.

Thus, if in his death and resurrection, Jesus closed with the foe, in what was billed as a traditional Holy War (in its technical meaning), in his life he is represented, for the most part, as battling a mythological foe: Satan and the demons. One can certainly still find a comparatively large use of martial imagery in the descriptions of the life of Jesus, but this approaches mere tokenism, inasmuch as the technical terms for Holy War are conspicuous by their absence.

This serves to cast the central significance of the Passion scene in relief. Not even the stresses of

contemporary Zealotism could finally persuade the framers of the Synoptic tradition to treat the life-work of Jesus along the lines of Holy War theology. It is not inconceivable that this contemporary movement may have been influential, with respect to the way the Passion is represented. The fact remains, nonetheless, that it is the passion, not the life, which is so construed. As concerns the treatment of Jesus' life, it appears that the old traditions were spiritualized,[50] which is almost tantamount to saying that they had, in the meantime, ossified.

---

[50] Thus Ladd, 146, can say: "Jesus reinterpreted the prophetic hope in terms of a spiritual rather than a military conflict," though to assign this reinterpretation to Jesus is a questionable step, in view of the nature of the sources. In this respect there is a concinnity between the Pauline literature and the Synoptics. Indeed, in his projection of an earthly conflict into a cosmological setting, Paul may have set a precedent for the Evangelists.

CHAPTER IV

THE DAY OF THE LORD TRADITION

Before proceeding to an analysis of the remainder of the Holy War imagery to be found in the New Testament, it is necessary to trace the development of an idea with which it is related in these passages and with which it was, through the centuries, tenaciously associative. This concept is that of the Day of the Lord. Furthermore, it is our feeling that the results garnered from this analysis will both clarify and fortify the conclusions we have arrived at, as concerns the significance of Jesus for the later interpretation of traditional motifs.

Origins and the Early Development of the Tradition. We turn, then, to the Old Testament again for an account of the origin of this concept and the early stages of its development. It ought first to be argued that the Biblical notion of the Day of the Lord is indigenously Israelite.[1] The precise reason for this is not apposite to

---

[1]Thus, Ladislav Černy, The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems (V Praze: Nákladem Filosofické Fakulty University Karlovy, 1948), 17, summarizing his investigation of the Assyro-Babylonian material, notes: " . . . we cannot find one single phrase, which could reasonably be considered an exact parallel to the Hebrew יום יהוה in its

this discussion, though the distinctive Hebrew notions of time undoubtedly contributed to this fact.

Furthermore, the use of the Day of Yahweh is, by and large, a proclivity of the Old Testament writing prophets. If one scans the entire corpus, one will discover approximately twenty occurrences of the term. Methodological considerations must here be broached. Von Rad is of the opinion that previous investigations as to the origins of the concept have proceeded on much too broad a basis, with the inclusion of too many ideas and concepts with but loose relation to the thought of the Day. Accordingly, " . . . an investigation must not allow itself . . . to go beyond the material evidence which mentions the concept of 'Day of Yahweh' <u>expressis verbis</u>."[2] Thus, he feels that one should limit the investigation to a discussion of the following verses: Isaiah 2.12; 13.6,9; 22.5; 34.8; Jeremiah 46.10; Ezekiel 7.19; 13.5; 30.3; Joel 1.15; 2.1,11; 3.4; 4.14; Amos 5.18,20; Obadiah 15; Zephaniah 1.7,8,14,18; 2.3 and Zechariah 14.1.

---

philological form and in its content." Again, "therefore יום יהוה, even considered simply from the philological point of view remains alone." Similar views are arrived at by R.S. Cripps, <u>A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos</u> (London: SPCK, 2d ed., 1960), 61 and Gerhard von Rad, "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," <u>The Journal of Semitic Studies</u> 4 (1959), 103: " . . . one thing has to be insisted upon, namely that the prophets have adopted the whole concept of the Day of Yahweh from the tradition of their own people and not from foreign sources."

[2]<u>Ibid</u>., 97n2.

However, this statement of methodology appears a bit too confining. Applied to the whole literary ambit (i.e., the Old Testament, the Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament) in which the notion plays a part, it would seem more judicious, while indeed basing the investigation upon the precise terminology, to allow the analagous forms of the concept[3] to inform the interpretation. Indeed, von Rad himself seems to equivocate in this regard and leaves the door open a bit wider elsewhere.[4]

Commentators are generally agreed that Amos 5.18-20 represents the earliest instance of the expression within the prophetic corpus.

> Woe to those who long presumptuously for the day of Yahweh!
> For of what purpose to you is the day of Yahweh?
> It is darkness and not light!
> As if a man should flee from the lion and the bear met him,

---

[3]Examples: "that day", "the last day", "day of judgment"/"wrath", "day of the Lord Jesus/Christ" and perhaps also the plural variations: "the latter days" and "those days".

[4]Theology II, 119,120:

> Form criticism and the investigation of the history of tradition have taught us that terms as important as these seldom appear alone, but are as a rule associated with a whole complex of ideas which have definite recurring themes of whose presence careful account must be taken. In this respect therefore, we must adopt a broader exegetical basis than can be provided by an examination of the term itself . . .

For an astute appraisal, similar to the above, see K.-D. Schunck, "Strukturlinien in der Entwicklung der Vorstellung vom 'Tag Yahwes'," Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964), 321.

Or entered the house and rested his hand against the
wall and the serpent bit him.
Is not the day of Yahweh darkness and not light?
Even gloomy and no brightness to it?[5]

This oracle is of significance in more ways than one, although it will not bear the weight that some have put on it.[6] Aside from representing the terminus a quo for the "Day of Yahweh" terminology, it is implicitly concerned to counter what was evidently a prevalent notion: that Yahweh's own people would be exempt from his visitation of vengeance. Amos' emphasis is both

---

[5]Our literal translation attempts to do justice to the contrasting elements in the passage. The "out of the frying pan into the fire" motif (So Robinson in T.H. Robinson and Friedrich Horst, Die Zwolf Kleinen Propheten [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1964], 93) is employed to enhance the gravity of the situation.

[6]For instance, it looms large in discussions which assume a developed pre-prophetic eschatology; e.g., Hugo Gressmann, Der Ursprung der israelitische-jüdischen Eschatologie (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905), 141ff. Against such elaborate non sequiters, C.F. Whitley's conclusion tends too far to the other extreme: " . . . whatever the origin of the term 'Day of Yahweh', there is no evidence that it was used in pre-exilic times in an eschatological sense" (The Prophetic Achievement [London: A.R. Mowbray and Company, 1963], 205). Cerny's view (80) is preferable: "We are convinced that the conception of the Day of Yahweh includes the kernel of the whole of eschatology, and that by the time of Amos it had its full eschatological meaning." However, if Cerny implies by this a fully-developed pre-Amos eschatology, this writer must renege.

unprecedented[7] and relatively unperpetuated[8] within that train of ideas.

This is not, however, to suggest that the later interpretations are merely of subsidiary value; they are, in fact able to furnish clues as to the provenance of the Day of Yahweh concept. Of the prophetic literature as a whole in which the term is found one may certainly say that the note of doom predominates;[9] the day is described as one of "vengeance" (Isaiah 34.8; Jeremiah 46.10), "darkness" (Joel 2.1,2; Amos 5.18; Zephaniah 1.15 bis), "wrath" (Isaiah 13.9; Ezekiel 7.19; Zephaniah 1.14) and "destruction" (Isaiah 13.6; Joel 1.15; Zephaniah 1.15). As we have earlier indicated some of the passages in the

---

[7]However, several scholars attempt to account for it. R.E. Clements, Prophecy and Covenant (Naperville: Allenson, 1965), 110n1, observes that R. Hentschke, "Gesetz und Eschatologie in der Verkündigung der Propheten," Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik 4 (1960), 46-56, argues for the origin of Amos' eschatology of doom in the radical interpretation of the curse of the law. A. S. Kapelrud, "God as Destroyer in the Preaching of Amos and in the Ancient Near East," Journal of Biblical Literature 71 (1952), 35, maintains that the proper parallel for the prophetic stress on Yahweh's destruction of his own people is found in Genesis 6-8, the story of the flood.

[8]See von Rad, "Origin," 105:

> . . . some prophets expressed the idea that in his day of battle Yahweh might also turn against Israel itself. This message, however, has to be considered as an interlude in the history of the concept, since the later prophets have returned to the concept that Yahweh's Day of war will mean salvation for Israel.

[9]See H. H. Rowley, The Faith of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956), 178. Chapter VII (177-201) is entitled "The Day of the Lord."

prophets in which the ancient notions of Holy War are revivified, let us at this point simply note that the description of the events on that Day is frequently cast in the form of a war; we are enabled, through the type of language employed, to visualize the brutal aftermath of battle.

Von Rad analyzed these passages form-critically and, on the basis of the pervasive battle-imagery, came to the following conclusion:

> the proper procedure for investigation is . . . to ask whether Israel herself did not have, in her own old traditions, some knowledge of the concept of Yahweh's coming specifically to wage a war, with its accompaniment of miraculous phenomena. This is, of course, . the case. In itself, the almost stereotyped connexion of the day of Yahweh with intervention in war reminds one of the holy wars and all the phenomena which traditionally accompanied them.[10]

Thus, according to von Rad, the ancient institution of Holy War provides the most plausible source for the kind of language employed in the announcement of the Eschatological Day. This seems a more salutary conclusion than that of Sigmund Mowinckel, who saw the Eschatological Day as having evolved from the New Year's Day celebration in Israel, at which time Yahweh was enthroned as the reigning king for another year. Summarizing the thrust

---

[10] Theology II, 123.

of his argument,[11] Mowinckel's analysis of the Psalter led him to isolate what he termed "Enthronement Psalms." They are connected with the harvest and the New Year Festival[12] and envisage Yahweh as King:

> Characteristic of this group is that they salute Yahweh as the king who has just ascended his royal throne to wield his royal power. The situation envisaged in the poet's imagination, is Yahweh's ascent to the throne and the acclamation of Yahweh as king; the psalm is meant as the song of praise which is to meet Yahweh on his 'epiphany,' his appearance as the new, victorious king.[13]

This, then, the New Year's Day, was Yahweh's festal day. At a later time this motif of the "festal" day evolved into the "eschatological" day of Yahweh.[14]

Von Rad, however, responded with a heady demurral. While Mowinckel's overall hypothesis represented a

---

[11]Though the primary source for his views is the two-volume Psalmenstudien (Amsterdam: Schippers, 1961), one can follow the argument in The Psalms in Israel's Worship (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), Volume I, 106f.

[12]Ibid., 106. The Psalms are: 47,93,96,97,98,99.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Mowinckel, He That Cometh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1959), 145:

> Its [the Day of Yahweh] original meaning is really the day of His manifestation or epiphany, the day of His festival, and particularly that festal day which was also the day of His enthronement, His royal day, the festival of Yahweh . . .

As a matter of fact, he maintains (132) that Amos 5.18 refers not to an eschatological day, but still has connection with the cult. To affirm this, he must connect verses 18-20 and 21-27, the latter group of which obviously describe the cult. This, however, is an unwarranted procedure; for such an original connection there is no evidence. The two are distinctly separate units.

significant g[redacted]in

this question[redacted] ex

a reference t[redacted] th

where the Day[redacted] of

Mowinckel[redacted] s s
from the [redacted]ult
ual evide[redacted]nce,
speak exp[redacted]ici
with the [redacted]onc

There[redacted]fore

of the comple[redacted]x of

Eschatologica[redacted]l Da

to take best [redacted]acco

---

[15]Von[redacted] Rad
insists that
the idea [redacted]of t
alienati[redacted]n fr
when foll[redacted]owed
tension i[redacted]n th
gree out[redacted]ide
and fear[redacted] com
"ἡμέρα," The[redacted]logi
(Grand Rapid[redacted]: E
"there is no [redacted]supp
supposition t[redacted]hat
the concept [redacted]f th
also H. Whee[redacted]er R
the Old Test[redacted]ment
141.

[16]Oth[redacted]er c
nored. Perh[redacted]ps t
expression" [redacted]So C
. . . ou[redacted] def
of Yahwe[redacted] adm
may have [redacted]exis
as e.g. [redacted]he d
tle or th[redacted]e da
Cf. Ringgren [redacted]260
which Cerny [redacted]dvan
fied. Indee[redacted], th

been widely adopted (albeit with modifications) though the debunkers are here active as well.[17] At any rate, we have felt it necessary to lay the foundations of our position firmly before proceeding to the erection of the superstructure.

In order to define more precisely the nature of the Day of the Lord, as enunciated by the prophets of Israel, the following preliminary statements will be enlarged upon:

1. Consistently, the "Day" is pictured as a day of unmitigated judgment and doom.

2. This doom is, with a few exceptions, directed against Israel's enemies (chiefly Egypt and Babylon).

Mowinckel's hypothesis of an Enthronement Festival, at least with respect to Canaanite practice. One might suggest that a happy solution would consist of an amalgam of von Rad's and Mowinckel's views. The motifs stemming from the Holy War tradition may have lingered on and helped to shape the content of the cultic myths, while simultaneously representing a historicizing (and potentially an eschatologizing) influence on it.

The Sinaitic theophany, as described in Exodus 19.16-19, may also have exerted considerable influence on the Day of the Lord complex, as maintained by J. Bourke, "Le jour de Yahvé dans Joel," Revue Biblique 66 (1959), 31: "Sa Joel's vision du numineux n'est pas mains mais plus impressionnante, et de loin, parce qu'il l'exprime en termes consacrés par la tradition, qui nous renvoient finalement à la théophanie du Sinai." Gressmann and Henning Fredricksson, 86,87, are cited by Bourke as essentially in agreement with this position.

[17] E.g., K.-D. Schunck, 320,321. To pose the question (321) as to how widely the ancient elements of the tradition were eschatological is not really to the point. The fact is that the prophetic application of them is along eschatological lines. See von Rad, Theology II, 124.

3. God himself is the center of attention in this eschatological[18] complex. It is his day.

First, one has only to notice the persistent nomenclature which is endemic to the Day of Yahweh motif to be aware of the pervasiveness of the idea of judgment. To do justice to this theme would be practically reproduce the prophetic literature, but representative examples will avail. Language descriptive of the wrath and anger of the Lord is prevalent (Isaiah 13.9,13; 34.8; 63.3-6; Jeremiah 46.10; 50.13,25; Ezekiel 7.8,12,13,14,19; Hosea 5.10; Micah 5.15; Zephaniah 1.15; 2.2,3; 3.8). Yahweh will arise to execute punishment on that day (Isaiah 10.3 "day of punishment" ; 24.21; Jeremiah 9.25; 50.27,31; Hosea 5.9; Micah 7.4; Zephaniah 1.12). Woe oracles and numerous allusions to terrestrial and celestial prodigies but add to the impression that the Day of the Lord will be first and foremost a dolorous time of reckoning by the divine of the inveterate iniquity of man.[19]

Qualifications are, however, necessary. By and

---

[18]The term "eschatology" is employed advisedly. The debate over the exact significance of the term continues. This work, at least, uses it in its broader perspective (characterizations of the Future), as over against the more restricted reference (characterizations of the End, the Eschaton).

[19]Thus Ernst Kutsch, "Heuschreckenplage und Tag Jahwes in Joel 1 und 2," Theologische Zeitschrift 2 (1962), 89, rightfully insists: "Wesentlicher Inhalt des Tages Jahwes ist nach den alttestamentlichen Quellen die Enthüllung des göttlichen Zornes und die Durchführung des Gerichtes an Jahwes Feinden."

large, the nations other than Israel are the proper objects of the divine ire on that Day, immunity being granted to Israel. Thus, Amos 5.18-20 did not enjoy wide currency in later days; nowhere is this more true than in apocalyptic thought.

> En résumé donc, on peut dire que la notion primitive du 'Jour de Yahvé,' du jugement de Dieu, de l'intervention de Dieu dans l'histoire, consiste surtout en une série de bénédictions pour Israël ... et, au contraire, en une suite de malédictions pour les nations étrangères.[20]

As a matter of fact, there are three different groupings, as concerns the object of Yahweh's wrath:[21] (1) Yahweh's visitation upon his own people, or the wicked among them; (2) upon all nations, including Israel; and (3) upon nations other than Israel. Examples of (1) are: Isaiah 2.10-22; Ezekiel 7 and Malachi 4; instances of (2) are Zephaniah 1.14-18; 2.1-15; finally, examples of (3), which, as one might expect, are considerably easier to come by, are: Ezekiel 13.5; 38,39; Isaiah 13.3-22; Obadiah 15 and Joel 3.9,10,12-14,19. Consequently, one is able to speak of an increasingly chauvinistic tone in the

---

[20] Fernand Couturier, "Le 'Jour de Yahvé' dans l'Ancien Testament," Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa 24 (1954), 199.

[21] This classification is suggested by Cripps, 299.

representations of the Day of Yahweh.[22]

Finally, we wish to stress further the fact that the eschatological Day accrues to Yahweh himself; he is its author. The genitive is significant; it implies that while the Lord may use human instrumentality to effect his purposes on that day, it is and remains his day.[23]

The "Day" in Apocalyptic Literature. Passing now to a discussion of the application made of the "Day" by Jewish apocalyptic literature, one notes a certain hardening and refining of meaning. Consonant with the unremitting insistence on the vicious character of the Day, one finds that the "Day of Judgment" becomes firmly ensconced as a terminus technicus. This is particularly true of I Enoch (1.7; 10.6,12; 16.1; 19.1; 22.4,11,13; 27.4; 60.6; 81.4; 84.4; 94.9; 96.8; 97.3,5; 98.8,10; 99.15; 100.4; 102.5;

---

[22]Commenting on Zephaniah 1.14-16; 3.8f, C. R. North, The Old Testament Interpretation of History (London: Epworth Press, r.p., 1953), 129, says:

> These verses are typical of the Day of Yahweh as it came to be conceived in exilic and post-exilic prophecy. Instead of being primarily directed against Israel, the 'Day' comes to be pictured as a day of judgment against Israel's enemies and oppressors.

Bourke, 202, offers an interesting explanation for this development:

> Nous avons vu qu'aux origines de la doctrine du Jour de Yahvé se trouve l'idée de la sainteté de Yahvé. Yahvé est saint: Israël a fait alliance avec lui. Toute la doctrine part de ce fait miraculeux. Mais la doctrine de l'armée qui marche contre Jérusalem est basée sur une idée différente; non pas 'Yahvé est saint,' mais 'Yahvé est Seigneur.'

[23]This parallels our earlier findings concerning

10f.5), though it is paralleled in other works (Jubilees 9.15; 10.17,22; 22.21; 23.11; 24.30,33; Vita Adae et Evae 26.4; 48.2; Secrets of Enoch 39.2; 48.9; 50.4; 51.3; 52.13; III Baruch 1.7; IV Ezra 7.38,39,102,104,113; 12.34; Psalms of Solomon 15.12; Apocalypse of Moses 12.1; Testament of Levi 1.1). Other designations which no doubt hark back as well to the Old Testament are: "day of condemnation" (Jubilees 5.10; 19.9) and "tribulation" (I Enoch 1.1; 55.3; 63.8; 96.2; 98.10; Testament of Levi 5.5).[24]

Typical of the apocalyptic élan to expand earlier concepts by means of additional detail is I Enoch 16.1:

> From the days of the slaughter and destruction and death of the giants, from the souls of whose flesh the spirits, having gone forth, shall destroy without incurring judgment--thus shall they destroy until the day of the consummation, the great judgment in which the age shall be consummated, over the Watchers and the godless, yea, shall be wholly consummated.

Though the notion of judgment is by all means native to the Old Testament descriptions of Yahweh's "Day," one must inquire as to how this could have undergone such an "absolutizing," so that the divine name plays

---

the increasingly monergistic tone of Holy War theology within the writing prophets.

[24]In the Apocrypha see II Esdras 7.43; 12.34; Wisdom 3.18; Ecclesiasticus 5.8; 51.10 bis,12; Judith 2.10; 16.17 and the Rest of Esther 11.8. Admittedly, some of the Apocalypses derive from the Christian era. A convenient list of "Day" passages in apocalyptic is given by Paul Volz, Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1903), 188ff. See also the index (in the Pseudepigrapha volume) of Charles' Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, though this is not an exhaustive listing.

no part in the apocalyptic formulae. For the "Day of Yahweh"/"Lord" does not occur within the entire corpus.[25]

As a beginning toward the resolution of this problem, it should be observed that it is precisely in that work (I Enoch) wherein one finds a proliferation of the day of judgment idea that references to the Son of Man abound. The question of importance to which an affirmative answer seems warranted is: Does the significance attaching to the person and office of the Son of Man in Enoch bulk so large that no need is felt to retain the traditional formulation of the Day as Yahweh's Day?

Though one could wish for a greater incidence, a transfer of the precise terminology does occur in 61.5:[26]

> And these measures shall reveal all the secrets of the depths of the earth, and those who have been destroyed by the desert, and those who have been devoured by the beasts, and those who have been devoured by the fish of the sea, that they may return and stay themselves on <u>the day of the Elect One</u>.

While the formula "day of the Son of Man" does not occur, the language employed of the Elect One is so

---

[25]One should, however, allude to oblique references of the sort found in II Baruch. 55.6 speaks of the "Day of the Mighty One," as does 49.2, though the reference to the Mighty One is to be inferred at that point.

[26]The <u>days</u> of the Elect One (by implication) are alluded to in 39.66. At any rate, the Son of Man so dominates the scene in the Similitudes that the "Day" passages could hardly have any other figure in mind. Cf. 69.27: "And he [the Son of Man] sat on the throne of his glory, and the <u>sum</u> of judgment was given unto the Son of Man."

strikingly similar to that which describes the Son of Man that one may conclude that the two designations trace to the same figure. Thus, the Day of the Elect One = the Day of the Son of Man.[27] In the words of S. B. Frost, who is countering R. H. Charles' view,

> the fact remains that the two figures are so at one in the startling, unique characteristics afforded them in both sources [Son of Man and Elect One]--if sources they truly are--that they can only be the same conception; both are the eschatological judge, both rule on the throne of his glory, both are revealed at the eschaton, both stand in a unique relation to the saints. Thus, either fills the whole picture, leaving no room for the other: They are in fact unmistakably in this book one and the same figure.[28]

Regardless of the merits of the foregoing argument, the fact which is patently clear is that in the Similitudes of Enoch the Son of Man practically usurps many of the duties and honors formerly relegated to

---

[27]It is necessary to buttress the supposition that the two figures are synonymous with this prior argument, thus rendering the conclusion something more than a facile assumption of the type made by D. S. Russell, who states that "the Old Testament 'Day of the Lord' now becomes the 'Day of the Elect One' and . . . the judgment is now placed in the hands of the Son of Man" (The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic [Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964], 344). Russell seems to have a penchant for making misleading statements; he speaks of 'The Day of the Messiah' in apocalyptic literature (272), when, in fact, the two members in this fictitious expression are never juxtaposed.

[28]Old Testament Apocalyptic (London: Epworth Press, 1952), 218n14.

Yahweh.[29] He is Judge,[30] Revealer[31] and Ruler.[32] Several times something resembling pre-existence is ascribed to him.[33] This newly-acquired autonomy asserts itself in the most unlikely places, so that whereas one can readily detect similarities in both terminology and thought between the Enochian Son of Man and the Isaianic Servant,[34] it nevertheless remains that it is the exalted features of the "Servant" complex, not the humble, which are

---

[29]However, one must not overlook the fact that the Son of Man remains subordinate to God. For "Judaism was always concerned to avoid the usurpation of God's place by anyone; and this fundamental principle also underlies all the greatest sayings about the Son of Man" (Mowinckel, Cometh, 374). This is indubitable, but only half the truth, for, as Mowinckel himself goes on to say, " . . . the Son of Man is exalted as near to God as was possible in Judaism, and too near to accord with the outlook of earlier orthodox Judaism" (Ibid.).

[30]38.2; 39.6; 49.1,3; 51.3; 53.6; 62.6. Mowinckel, Ibid., 393,394: " . . . the prevailing conception [in Enoch] is that God hands over his authority as judge to the Son of Man, even if the latter is always thought of as acting by God's warrant and as His instrument."

[31]46.3; 49.2,4; 51.1; 61.5,8; 62.2,3; 69.27.

[32]39.7; 48.4,7; 51.5; 53.6; 62.7,8,14,15.

[33]39.6,7; 48.2,3; 62.7. Several scholars are disinclined to subscribe to this view; e.g., Matthew Black, "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature," Expository Times 60 (1948/1949), 11-15 and T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 32 (1950), 171-193. For the affirmative view, see Mowinckel, Cometh, 370-373.

[34]Thus, in Enoch, the Son of Man is termed the Elect One on numerous occasions (39,40,45,49,51,53,55,61, 62), the Righteous One (38,53) and the "light of the Gentiles" (48.4).

emphasized in Enoch. According to Mowinckel, the critical question is,

> which 'servant of the Lord' underlies the picture of the Son of Man in I Enoch? Is it the true Servant, who voluntarily sacrifices his honor and his life for 'the many,' or the transformed one, nationalistic, victorious and triumphant, as found in the interpretations of the Targum and of later Judaism in general.[35]

That the second answer to the question is obviously the correct one is but an indication of the elevated stature that the Son of Man/Messiah enjoys in I Enoch:

> Whereas before the messianic figure has always been that of an office bearer in the divine economy, this new conception is personally important: not only does he act and rule and even judge in God's place, but he has a personal relationship to those who are his.[36]

Summarizing, the increased prominence accorded the Son of Man in I Enoch goes hand-in-hand with the fact that certain Old Testament formulations, which stressed the centrality of Yahweh, were adapted or revised. In this case, the form is retained but the content is changed (The Day of Judgment), thus producing a certain elasticity

---

[35] Cometh, 414. Cf. Morna Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London: SPCK, 1959), 146:

> Even those phrases in I Enoch which seem to have been taken directly from the Old Testament pictures of Messiah and Servant do not convey the essential features of those figures: it is, in fact, these essential elements which are missing from the portrait of the Son of Man. Thus there is no reference to the Son of Man beingg subjected to any kind of suffering, such as was endured by the Servant; he is not himself in need of vindication, but is the vindicator of others; he is the Savior, not of the wicked, whom on the contrary he condemns, but of the righteous.

[36] Frost, 219.

in the hitherto arbitrary nature of the formula. As we shall attempt to demonstrate later, apocalyptic thought set a precedent in this regard which was to become significant for the New Testament usage of the concept; it paved the way for an eschatological understanding which would retain old forms while infusing them with new content.

Qumran and the "Day." To insure that the New Testament backgrounds of the Day of the Lord idea are satisfactorily explicated, one must pause to discuss the occurrences of the idea in the Dead Sea literature.[37]

---

[37]For an assessment of the tradition in Samaritan circles see chapter 18 ("The Day of Vengeance and Recompense") of John MacDonald, The Theology of the Samaritans (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964). He says: "The subject of the future restoration of the community of God and the Day of Resurrection and the Day of Vengeance and Recompense occupied the attention of the Samaritans more than any other" (357). This combines, interestingly enough, with the fact that " . . . there is a great deal said about the military work of the Taheb, from the Defter's early sections right through to the latest literature." The most famous of all descriptions of the Day (so MacDonald) is Markah's in the Memar IV.12. It merits citation in full:

> [It is] the day of recompense for all the good, the day of resurrection for all men, the day of regret for all the wicked, the day of reckoning for all things done, the day of recompense for the good and the evil, the day of interrogation about all things done by all creatures, the day of trembling for all feet, the day of terror for all limbs, the day of reckoning for all actions, the day in which every person receives recompense, the day of judgment, the day of tears, the day of deliverance, the day of assembly, the day of truth, the day of fear, the day of the standing, the day of coming forth from the ground, the day of grief for all the wicked, the day of joy for all who were obedient, the day on which the Lord of the world shall appear and proclaim, 'I, even I,

One observes first that the sect conforms to the apocalyptic tradition in its terminological designations of the "Day." The Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk twice refers to the Day of Judgment (2.18,20). In the latter case, the explanation offered for Habakkuk's poignant cry ("Hush before the Lord, all the earth!") is: "This refers to all the heathen who have been worshipping stock and stone. On the Day of Judgment God will annihilate all who worship idols and all the wicked from the earth."[38] An apt description of this verse (and it would describe the genius of the Qumran community) would be "militant provincialism."[39] As we have been involved in analyzing the allied concepts of Holy War and the Day of the Lord, we are not surprised to see evidence of this alliance borne out again.

---

am he, and there is none other with me.'

[38]Translation by Gaster, 252. The "Day of Judgment" occurs also in the Commentary on the Book of Micah 1.5. Cf. the Manual of Discipline 9.23 ("Day of Requital," which is the technical Samaritan term for the Day of Judgment) and the War Scroll 7.5 (יום נקם לאל).

[39]In fact, it ought to be said that the apocalyptic and Qumran literatures are at one in this jingoistic strain, as relates to the question of whom the Day is directed against. One should, however, in all fairness say that the criterion for judgment came increasingly, in apocalyptic thought, to consist of an ethical, rather than an ethnic character, commensurate with the rise of universalistic and individualistic tendencies. See Russell, 380,381, who says that in some of the later books "the future life is expressed not so much in terms of a restored nation in an earthly kingdom as in terms of individual and personal survival in the heavenly Paradise."

As one might expect, the work in which ideas of judgment and retribution are most articulated is the War Scroll. Indeed, the military metaphor so completely swamps the earlier way of speaking that the conception of "that day" (יום ההוא)[40] finds its most appropriate expression in the "day of battle"/"warfare"/"combat" (7.6, 13-19; 15.12,15).[41] Of special interest is the passage found at the end of chapter 13:

> Of old hast Thou set for Thyself a day of warfare against wick[edness], to triumph in truth and to destroy guilt; to bring darkness low and raise light on high;[ ] [to ensure that] the Sons of Light stand for ever, and to destroy all the Sons of Darkness; to bring joy to [all]. Hast Thou not appointed us for [that time?].[42]

What can be said about Qumran's employment of the "Day" idea? First, it is to be seen that here, as in the apocalyptic corpus, the Old Testament formula, Day of the Lord, is conspicuous by its absence. Here, as there, interest in the fantastic details which serve to satisfy curiosity as to the nature of the eschatological day is heightened. Whereas in the earlier prophetic announcements of the Old Testament the bare fact of the Day's

---

[40] See 18.5.

[41] יום המלחמה; יום קרב רבה; יום המלחמה הזה; יום המלחמה הזאת; יום. This helps confirm our above-mentioned observation of the flexibility inherent in the expressions of the Day, as earlier evidenced in the apocalyptic literature.

[42] The brackets are Gaster's and represent lacunae in the text; the suggested readings are his as well.

proximity was the preponderating emphasis,[43] the line stretching from the Old Testament apocalyptic sections to Qumran evinces a growing stress on precisely what that day will entail for both the wicked and the just. Commensurate with this development is the transition from attention on the one who brings the day to what the day will be like.

If in the feature just noted, the Qumran literature and Jewish apocalyptic dovetail, in another respect, as we indicated earlier, the sect's self-understanding reaches back to the Old Testament. For the ancient traditions of Holy War are revived; it is here that God attains his majority as a Warrior.[44] As relates to our present concern, the coming of the Day of Judgment will mean nothing but the revelation of his superiority in leading out the holy community against the "troops of Belial."

---

[43]See Isaiah 13.6; Ezekiel 30.3; Obadiah 15; Joel 1.15; 2.1; 4.14; Zephaniah 1.7,14. It will be recalled that the possibility was raised whether the cry "the day of Yahweh is near," which occurs in these verses, "was not the stereotyped cry by which men were summoned for military service in earlier times, or a cry with which men once went into battle with Yahweh" (von Rad, Theology II, 124n39).

[44]He is called the "Lord of Battles" (Scroll 10).

CHAPTER V

THE DAY OF THE LORD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

What relevance has the preceding discussion for the way in which the meaning applied to the Day of the Lord unfolds in the New Testament? Tersely stated, we hope to employ what has been said to elucidate the process whereby the "Day" came to be applied to Jesus[1] and to discuss the significance of such a reformulation. This discussion is necessary, because, in contrast to what is popularly felt to be the case, the traditional "Day of the Lord" does not enjoy great currency in the New Testament;[2] the exact form occurs but four times.[3] It is, of course, true that there is an abundance of varied

---

[1]Though such a reapplication occurs formally only in the Pauline literature (I Corinthians 1.8; 5.5; II Corinthians 1.14; Philippians 1.6,10; 2.16), there is material evidence to indicate that the Eschatological Day was legitimately applied to him.

[2]John Marsh, The Fulness of Time (London: Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1952), 26, correctly stresses this fact.

[3]Acts 2.20 (a citation from Joel); I Thessalonians 5.2; II Thessalonians 2.2; II Peter 3.10. There are, however, references to the "day of God" (II Peter 3.12) and the "great day of God the Almighty" (Revelation 16.14; cf. II Baruch 49.2; 55.6).

designations for the eschatological day,[4] which, in the view of one writer,[5] indicates "something of the fascination it had for the men of the New Testament." In accordance with methodological decisions made earlier, we reiterate that there is no reason why one should be limited to a discussion of the *expressis verbis* occurrences; the related forms can play vital, supportive roles. The technical expressions of the concept should, however, inform the nontechnical, and not *vice versa*.

This writer takes exception to the way in which the tremendous implications of and the fascinating development involved in the transition from the "Day of Yahweh" to the "Day of the Lord Jesus" are glossed over by many authors. For instance, J. A. T. Robinson dismisses the phenomenon peremptorily:

> . . . it is clear that "the day of the Lord Jesus" is in itself simply the traditional "day of the Lord" of

---

[4]The Synoptists' preference is for "that day" (Matthew 7.22; 24.36; 26.39; Mark 2.20; 6.11 [a variant reading]; 13.32; 14.25; Luke 6.23; 10.12; 17.31; 21.34; but also in John 14.20; 16.23,26; Romans 2.16; I Thessalonians 5.4; II Thessalonians 1.10; II Timothy 1.12,18; 4.8. John's distinctive contribution is "the last day" (6.39,40,44,54; 11.24; 12.48). However, a usage more characteristic of apocalyptic is in view as well: there are references to a "day of judgment" (Matthew 11.22; II Peter 2.9; 3.7; I John 4.17; Jude 6 ("judgment of the great day"); a "day of wrath" (Romans 2.5; Revelation 6.17 ("a great day of their wrath") and a "day of visitation" (I Peter 2.12).

[5]Leon Morris, The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 61.

> the Old Testament, with Christ, 'the Lord' of the Christian community, taking the place of Yahweh. . . . for the origin of the phrase there is no need to look beyond the Old Testament, modified now by the definition of God in the face of Jesus Christ.[6]

Such a facile assumption ought surely to be augmented by a critical scrutiny of the intervening factors which produced the equation "Day of the Lord" = "Day of Jesus Christ." Otherwise, we are left with a most extraordinary effect without a satisfactory delineation of its cause.

The Synoptics. As an introduction to a possible answer to this question, it is obvious that, given certain deviations, the Similitudes of Enoch have left their mark upon the Synoptic eschatology. For the Son of Man plays a conspicuous role here as well. While we shall concern ourselves subsequently with some of the Son of Man sayings, it is enough at this point to refer to an index such

---

[6] Jesus and His Coming (London: SCM Press, 1957), 19,20. Similarly, J. A. MacCulloch, "Eschatology" in Hasting's Dictionary of Ethics and Religion, Volume V, 379 and G. R. Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Future (London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1954), 130. Regardless of what one thinks of the worth of his explanation, H. A. Guy, The New Testament Doctrine of the Last Things (London: Oxford Press, 1948), 108ff, is not guilty of this, or is Dale Moody, The Hope of Glory (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 217:

> It was the application of developing Christology, by which the conviction of Jesus Christ as Lord became established, that transformed the day of the Son of Man [though this is a formula hard to come by!] in eschatology to the day of our Lord Jesus Christ.

as H. E. Todt[7] provides, to be apprised of their prominence in the tradition. In the presence of such wealth, we naturally are led to inquire whether the Son of Man has a day assigned to him. And, again, analogous to what we found to be the case in the apocalyptic literature, this expression is confined to a single passage[8] (Luke 17.22-27):

> And he said to the disciples, 'The days are coming when you will desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man [μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν[9] τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνθρώπου], and you will not see it. And they will say to you, 'Lo, there!' or 'Lo, here!' Do not go, do not follow them. For as the lightning flashes and lights up the sky from one side to the other, so will the Son of Man be in his day [ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ]. But first he must suffer many things and be rejected by this generation. As it was in the days of Noah, so will it be in the days of the Son of Man.[10]

---

[7] The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, translated by Dorothea M. Barton (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 364-366.

[8] Corroborating evidence for the conjunction of "Son of Man" and the Day is afforded by the expression ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη in Matthew 24.36 and Luke 21.34, where it can only refer to the παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Matthew 24.39).

[9] D inserts τούτων after ἡμερῶν. Though not germane to the present discussion, it appears that throughout this section (in Luke) D manifests a definite propensity to interpret the references to the future coming of the Son of Man in terms of Jesus' earthly ministry.

[10] Verse 30 refers to "the day when the Son of Man is revealed." However, this is not strictly apposite to our concern since one has here not a technical formula but a description. "Day" is absolutized and is not defined by reference to the person of the Son of Man, but to his ἀποκάλυψις.

Though we see here reference to the Son of Man's Day (24), this cannot serve as the crux of the argument, for ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ is omitted by some manuscripts.[11] We are left then with the double reference to the days of the Son of Man (22,26). Todt has successfully demonstrated that the form in Q was singular ("day of the Son of Man") and that Luke has introduced the plural into 22 and 26.[12] For Matthew and Luke agree in comparing the coming (Matthew has his customary παρουσία) of the Son of Man with the sudden κατακλυσμός in Noah's days.

> The comparison is not primarily concerned with the established state of affairs in Noah's time, but with the inrush of the destructive flood which was not expected by the heedless population. . . . The use of the plural 'days' suggests a different concept; 'days of the Son of Man' implies a state of affairs of some duration rather than the suddenness of an event. Since this concept of a longer duration is in accord with Luke's concept of the Son of Man, we must assume that Luke as editor formulated v26.[13]

This then parallels the phenomenon which developed in I Enoch. "The transcendent sovereignty of the Son of Man has attained so high an importance that prerogatives

---

[11] P75, B, D, it. On other grounds as well, the abbreviated reading would seem to be original, for it is both shorter and more difficult. At any rate, scholars sometimes appear oblivious of this difficulty.

[12] See also C. H. Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (London: Collins Press, 1961), 63n2, who agrees to this point.

[13] Todt, 51.

of God pass over to the figure of the Perfecter."[14]

If one asks how this fact affects the question of how the Day could be ascribed to Jesus, the answer is that from an early point in the life of the Christian community, Jesus was identified with the Son of Man. A careful study of the Son of Man sayings in the Synoptics reveals that Jesus himself had not made this self-identification, but this is not to regard the church's tack as unwarranted, for many of Jesus' sayings were heuristic in nature and begged for further theological explication.[15]

It can now be seen that all of the necessary ingredients were at hand in order for the final equation to be effected. For, in the first place, both the

---

[14] Ibid., 52. Earlier (Ibid.) he says: "The day of judgment which was formerly understood to be the day of Yahweh has now been transferred from God to the Son of Man." Gerhard Delling is in accord with this when he notes that at the decisive point, the referring of the day to the Messiah rather than to God, the content of the New Testament and the Apocalyptic works is the same ("ἡμέρα," The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Volume II, 951).

[15] R. H. Fuller, in asking the question, "What then is the relation between Jesus and the glorified Son of Man?" recognizes that the same texts (Mark 8.38; Matthew 19.28) which posit a distinction between them also imply an organic connection. "Though Jesus is not to be identified in his ministry tout court with the coming Son of Man, he is closely associated with him" (The Mission and Achievement of Jesus [London: SCM Press, r.p., 1963], 102,103). Todt's salutary conclusion is that while there is not a "Christological continuity" between the two figures, there is a "soteriological correlation" (though this reverses his emphasis) (226). The same writer indicates the main steps in "the transition from the soteriological use of the name Son of Man in

apocalyptic and synoptic traditions knew of a Day of the Son of Man. Next, the primitive church proclaimed Jesus to be no other than the Son of Man, thus enabling the "Day" to be transferred from the Son of Man to Jesus. Let us summarize the steps involved in the development up to this point.

1. The ancient Israelites knew of theophanic "days" in battle and plague.
2. The traditions in which accounts of these theophanies were preserved were utilized by the prophets in depicting the eschatological "Day of the Lord."
3. Because of the escalation which the person of the Son of Man underwent in apocalyptic, the Day of the Lord became his day.
4. The New Testament equated Jesus and the Son of Man.
5. The day was transferred to Jesus, the result of which is that Paul is able to speak of the "Day of the Lord Jesus Christ."[16]

Jesus' teaching to the Christological understanding in the primitive community" (226-231).

[16]It will be seen that the present writer finds himself in basic disagreement with T. F. Glasson's view: "It is important to observe that the development of the advent imagery sprang from the conviction that Jesus was Lord not [as has been thought for many years] from the conviction that He was Messiah" (His Appearing and His Kingdom London: Epworth Press, 1953 , 11), though our discussion is concerned with but one facet of the advent complex, namely, as this is understood in terms of the "Day." William Neil assents to the view espoused by the present writer. Thus, "the Parousia strain is too deeply rooted in the gospels to be explained away, and the transition from the Old Testament Day of the Lord to the New Testament Day of Christ must be by way of the Son of Man" (The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1950], xl). See also Mowinckel, Cometh, 392, for a similar view.

Though this is the primary datum one must reckon with in documenting the process whereby the Day of Yahweh accrued to Jesus, another parallel development no doubt expedited this process. There are two main steps to be considered in this development.

In the first place, it is a commonplace that the Septuagint everywhere uses the term κύριος to translate the tetragrammaton YHWH. Whereas, in the Hebrew text various names were employed to designate the Divine, in the Septuagint κύριος preempts the field. The rationale behind such preemption is explained by C. H. Dodd: "The complete disappearance of any personal name for God from the Greek Bible, and the substitution of the title κύριος amounted in itself to a manifesto of monotheism."[17]

If one bears in mind the lofty ideas associated with this term, it is only the familiarity of the expression which checks amazement at the fact that the New Testament, in its use of ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς , ascribes such an honorific concept to Jesus. Divinity which was exclusively relegated to Yahweh in the Old Testament is now shared by Jesus,[18] a step in the development which

---

[17] The Bible and the Greeks (London: Hodder and Stoughton, r.p., 1964), 11.

[18] Though at the beginning stages of this development "all that the LXX usage opens up . . . is a functional identity between the exalted Kyrios and the Yahweh-Kyrios of the Old Testament and LXX" (R. H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology [New York:

ultimately led to the Trinitarian formulations. Consequently, the ascription of those ideas (e.g., the Day) to Jesus which had been ascribed only to God in the Old Testament was facilitated from this side also. Expressed in terse fashion, the Day of the Lord is, accordingly, the Day of Yahweh/Jesus.

It has been necessary to provide a rather loquacious review of the development of the Day of the Lord concept, for it is this which informs much of the Holy War ideas in the rest of the New Testament, particularly in the Pauline epistles. But it is also our feeling that a delineation of these dual concepts will both elucidate and solidify conclusions we have already arrived at, with respect to the Synoptic material.

Thus, we maintain that it is the tradition of the "Day" which served as the immediate impetus for the New Testament asseverations of Holy War. It has already been indicated that the mere weight of background ideas represented the mediate impetus. However, the vehicle by which the Holy War traditions were passed on was that of the Day of the Lord motif, for the two concepts were closely associated.

Let us attempt to explain this association. It is clear that descriptions of a future time of judgment

---

Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965], 68) (italics his).

and upheaval (the Day) exercised great influence on the ancients. Consequent upon the acceptance of such ideas, however, came the feeling that such infelicitous times would descend only upon other peoples; the elect would be spared. Hence the doctrine of Holy War, which implied that God's people would assist him in the meting out of judgment, proved to be a fitting and durable companion idea. Thus, if the notion of the Day suggests the idea of visitation, the notion of the War suggests the idea of vindication.[19]

It remains to be seen that these allied terms remain wedded in some portions of the New Testament. In this sense one may speak of the Eschatological Day motif as a catchword, mention of which would summon up immense reserves of traditional Holy War ideas. Therefore, those "Day" passages which also envisage prospects of a war are not the result of a fortuitous join; rather, the introduction of the Day of the Lord idea into a work meant that that expression would usually at the same time serve as the medium for its elaboration in terms of war motifs.

The Pauline Literature. Analyzing, then, Paul's references to the day of the Lord Jesus/Christ (I Corinthians

---

[19]This amalgam William R. Murdock describes with respect to Jewish apocalyptic literature ("History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism," Interpretation 21 [1967], 177,178).

1.8; II Corinthians 1.14; Philippians 1.6,10; 2.16),[20] one is impressed with the fact that the apocalyptic notion of the day as a day of judgment is implicitly retained, though the exact expression is not. That day will judge both the Christian community (I Corinthians 1.8; Philippians 1.6,10) and the apostle himself (II Corinthians 1.14; Philippians 2.16). But, taken as a group, these passages hold out a rather cheery prospect for the believer, so that with Christ sustaining him, he will appear "guiltless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."[21] Such a tempering, in the ideas encompassing that Day, of the

---

[20]In the interests of precision, I Corinthians 5.5 is better reserved for other purposes, since a number of ancient authorities omit "Jesus" after "Lord"; thus the traditional "day of the Lord" is in vogue.

[21]I Corinthians 1.8. Elsewhere, the day can be described as a "day of redemption" (Ephesians 4.30). Cf. II Corinthians 6.2 ("day of salvation"). One can at this point contrast Paul and the apocalyptic work of I Enoch, though at other points there is considerable affinity. In B. Brinkmann's words ("Die Lehre von der Parusie beim H. Paulus in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Anschauungen des Buches Henoch," Biblica 13 [1932], 334):

> Gegenstand der Hoffnung [in Paul] ist nicht das Gericht über die Gottlosen, sondern das versprochene Gottesreich, das 'bei Christus sein.' Anders im Buche Henoch. Dort steht das Gericht als solches ganz im Vordergrund. Das Gottesvolk erwartet es mit Sehnsucht, weil es ihm die Befreiung von seinen politischen, heidnischen Unterdrückern bringt, und freut sich an den Strafen und Qualen der Gottlosen.

Cf. F. W. Beare, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), 53: " . . . while Old Testament prophecy tended more and more to paint that Day [Day of the Lord] in sombre colors, Christ transforms it for his believers into the day of salvation; for he 'rescues us from the Wrath to come' . . ."

severity which characteristically held the field in apocalyptic thought, is similar to the earlier tendency seen in the Old Testament, where some of the later "Day" passages qualify Amos' harsh tones, so that Israel's doom is no longer ineluctable (Isaiah 34.8; Joel 3.5; 4.16; Zephaniah 2.3).[22]

Lieselotte Mattern is aware of this comparatively blissful lot of the Christian, as this is discussed in the Pauline writings: "Das Objekt dieses Gerichtes ist nach Paulus die ganze Menschheit--denn--noch werden die Christen von diesem Gericht befreit."[23] She asks how one ought to understand this discrepancy, for elsewhere Paul ostensibly consigns the whole world to the Great Assize:

> Paulus kennt die jüdische Gerichtsterminologie und bejaht sie; er teilt mit dem Spätjudentum die Vorstellung eines jüngsten Gerichtes, eines Tages des Zorns dessen Ergebnis die endgültige Vernichtung der Betroffenen sein wird. Das Verständnis des Tages des Gerichtes, bei dem das Urteil noch offen steht . . . dient Paulus nur dazu, die Ungerechtigkeit aller Menschen vor diesem Gericht aufzuweisen (Romans 3.20).[24]

---

[22]It was quite possibly the events of the Exile which produced this tempering. The feeling evidently was that the sufferings of that time were sufficient fulfilment of the dark forebodings of the seers. See Ernst Jenni, "Day of the Lord" in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1962), I, 785.

[23]Das Verstandnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1966), 68. Miss Mattern is of the opinion that ὀργή and ἀπώλεια become, for Paul, technical terms for the day of the last judgment (59-61).

[24]Ibid., 67,68.

Miss Mattern explains this inconsistency in terms of its precedent in Late Judaism, where one often hears of a "radicalizing of the destructive judgment on one part of mankind and freedom for another part."[25] While this may partially satisfy the demands of the problem, our question is whether such an answer really takes serious stock of the unique features of early Christian faith. What was to prevent such buoyant prospects from issuing in a mere rebirth of chauvinism? As we have already somewhat alluded to and hope to argue further, this felicitous picture is not the result of a naive belief in the inveterate righteousness of the Christian camp, but rather of a profound conviction, as to the definitive nature of Jesus' battle on the cross.

Having endeavored to elucidate the process whereby the day can become the day of Jesus Christ, one is able to observe a remarkable fluidity inherent in the idea from its very beginning. This is the case, first of all, with respect to the subject(s) of the day. Here authority is the determining factor; the central role played by a figure in a given body of literature becomes the criterion by which the future day can be said to be his day, whether Yahweh, the Son of Man, or Jesus Christ. For the Old Testament ascribes the day to Yahweh, the Similitudes of

---

[25] Ibid., 69.

Enoch to the Son of Man and the New Testament to Jesus.

The character of the day varies as well. Subsequent to Amos' bleak proclamation, which itself seems intended to counter previous notions of the day as a day of blessedness, there are intimations of the possibility of Israel's escaping the doom which that day will usher in. In apocalyptic the accent is again on the darker aspects of that day (Day of Judgment), though, of course, there are numerous passages which hint of mitigation for the elect.[26] Finally, as we have seen, the day in the New Testament tends to assume a brighter aspect.[27] This would tend to indicate that there was apparently always a concern to retain traditional designations and ideas. Yet, at the same time, the unique character of each passing age continually demanded adaptation and interpretation.

That this binary concept is thus taken directly into the New Testament may be seen, first of all, in

---

[26]In I Enoch 60.6 the day is a "covenant" for the elect and an "inquisition" for sinners. Elsewhere, the day is referred to as a "day of mercy and blessing" (Psalms of Solomon 18.6 5).

[27]J. E. Fison, The Christian Hope: The Presence and the Parousia (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954), 117:

> Finally, Jesus transformed the conception of the day of Yahweh, or the day of the Lord, for [as the early church realized] he was the Lord. By such a transformation the fear of the largely unknown was turned into the expectation of the at least partly known. Grimness gave way to glory and the threats of

I Thessalonians 5.1ff, where the old formula "day of the Lord" lingers on:

> But as to the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need to have anything written to you. For you yourselves know well that the day of the Lord will come like a thief in the night.[28] When people say, 'There is peace and security,' then sudden destruction will come upon them as travail comes upon a woman with child, and there will be no escape. But you are not in darkness, brethren, for that day to surprise you like a thief. For you are all sons of light and sons of the day; we are not of the night or of darkness. So then let us not sleep, as others do, but let us keep awake and be sober. For those who sleep sleep at night, and those who get drunk are drunk at night. But, since we belong to the day, let us be sober, and put on the breastplate of faith and love, and for a helmet the hope of salvation.

It is entirely probable that the command for the Christian to don his armor in view of the impending day of the Lord (a day of "sudden destruction")[29] is a summons to participate in "holy war" activity (though "breastplate" and "helmet" might suggest only defensive

---

judgment to the thrill of love.

[28]David Daube, The Sudden in the Scriptures (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), 29n6, describes the intriguing development of the "thief" motif. Originally, Jesus, in Matthew 24.43, evidently referred to an actual case of a man who had failed to protect his house from thieves. In I Thessalonians one is fast moving away from this concrete basis, as the day is described as a thief. II Peter describes this "thief-day" in apocalyptic detail; finally, in Revelation 3.3 it is stated that Christ himself will come like a thief. See also Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1963), 48ff.

[29]This is reminiscent of the Old Testament prophetic depictions of the day; see Isaiah 13.6; Joel 1.15 and Zephaniah 1.15.

action).[30] That this recalls the earlier traditions is made certain as the various verbal affinities are noted. In the first place, the suddenness of destruction which that day will bring is compared to the travail which "comes upon a woman with child" (3).[31] This phrase is so prominent in the archaic representations of the Day of the Lord that it can be called a constituent metaphor (Isaiah 13.8; 21.3; 26.17,18; 42.14;[32] Jeremiah 4.31; 6.34; 13.21; 22.23; 30.6; 49.22,24; 50.43; Hosea 13.13; Micah 4.9,10).[33] Isaiah describes the day of the Lord (which "is near"), refers to it as "destruction" (13.6) and says of its victims: "they will be in anguish like

---

[30] De Vaux, 262, takes exception to von Rad, who "has recently . . . suggested that the holy wars of Israel were always defensive wars." For

> the conquest of the Promised Land is certainly described as a holy war, as the holy war, in the Book of Josue, and whatever the date of its redaction or the part to be attributed to its redactors, they certainly did not invent this tradition (italics his).

However, as relates to the kind of action described in I Thessalonians 5, de Vaux admits that "During the period of the Judges and under the reign of Saul, the Israelites fought only defensive wars."

[31] "and there will be no escape." Cf. Isaiah 20.6; Jeremiah 11.11; 44.14; 46.6; 48.8; 50.29; Joel 2.3. The Amos 5.18-20 passages also assumes the impossibility of escape.

[32] Here the metaphor occurs in connection with the description of the Lord as a "man of war," which is egregiously Holy War talk.

[33] It is this idea which undoubtedly explains the later expression "travail pains of the Messiah," used of the period of distress before God's final triumph. See Russell, 272,273.

a woman in travail" (8). Both accounts (Isaiah 13.9,13 and I Thessalonians 5.9) suggest that the Lord's wrath will be vented on that day. Furthermore, verse eight may originally hark back to a call to battle, now hortatively expressed. One is reminded of passages like Jeremiah 46.3ff:

> Prepare buckler and shield,
> and advance for battle!
> Harness the horses;
> mount O horsemen!
> Take your stations with your helmets,
> polish your spears,
> put on your coats of mail!

Again, the light-darkness dualism, as seen in verses four and five, plays a large role in the prophetic depictions of the eschatological day (Amos 5.18,20; Zephaniah 1.15).[34] However, it would seem that the use of "sons of darkness" and "sons of light" is strikingly similar to Qumran theology, the War Scroll in particular, as the very title of that work suggests. In fact, we wish here to reiterate the view that Paul, at certain points, and the author of Ephesians were influenced by the same kind of theology which influenced the Dead Sea poets; the difference lies in the fact that the former did not consider it necessary to exploit this thought to the vigorous lengths which the Covenanters did. As to why this was the case has already been touched on; that

---

[34] Cf. Romans 13.12: "Let us then cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light."

is, Jesus, in his death and resurrection was considered to have fought the conclusive war; any subsequent talk of Holy War, though employing the traditional terminology, could be used to depict mere skirmishes and mopping-up operations.

Though the significance of Jesus' combat spelled diminishing returns for the Holy War tradition in early Christianity, we have already sketched what we feel to be the plus factor in its tenuous presence within the New Testament; namely, the Day of the Lord idea. This in turn signifies the tremendous influence of apocalyptic thought within the New Testament. This influence has not been taken sufficient account of; Ernst Kasemann is among those who are rightfully seeking to redress the grievance, following, in this case, the examples of Albert Schweitzer, Johannes Weiss and Richard Kabisch. Indeed, he sees apocalyptic thought as providing the impetus for Christian theology.[35]

---

[35] "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 57 (1960), 162-185. At the close of another article he says: "Ich hoffe deutlich gemacht zu haben, warum ich die Apokalyptik als Mutter der urchristlichen Theologie bezeichne" ("Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965], Volume II, 130). Of this trend Hugh Anderson says:

> There is scarcely a more important trend in contemporary New Testament scholarship than the rediscovery and renewal of the view, especially under Käsemann, that the chief formative influence for primitive Christian theology as a whole was the earliest

As this impinges more directly upon our concern, it can be said that the New Testament in general and Paul in particular evince a certain dialectic between the historical (in this case, Jesus' warfare) and apocalyptic (in this case, grandiose sketches of the eschatological day).[36] As soon as the Day of the Lord motif was introduced, it could not but bring in its train the old familiar war imagery. But eventually the full significance of what Jesus had done was to come to awareness and the apocalyptic strains would be gradually drowned out.[37]

Continuing, our couplet makes its appearance in Romans 13.11-14 as well. We have already argued that "the day" in verse 12 refers to the day of the Lord ("of Christ," according to Paul), the Parousia. That this is so seems established by two considerations. First, there is a quasi-insistence on the imminence of the Day

---

Church's Jewish apocalyptic heritage . . . <u>Jesus and Christian Origins</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 143.

[36]What Wilhelm Grundmann says about the relationship of Paul to the early apostolic tradition is true of apocalyptic as well: "Das Verhältnis des Paulus zur urapostolischen Tradition ist also dialektisch; er betont einerseits seinen Zusammenhang mit ihr, andererseits seine Unabhängigkeit von ihr" ("Überlieferung und Eigenaussage im eschatologischen Denken des Apostels Paulus," <u>New Testament Studies</u> 8 [1961], 13).

This ties in with our earlier thesis that it was the earliest tradition which envisaged Jesus as a warrior, and that the later circles took care to, at least in part, eviscerate that impression.

("salvation" = the day[38]), which accords with the early Christian conviction of the nearness of the Parousia. Secondly, that σωτηρία is to be equated with the day of the Lord is extremely likely, in view of the bright prospects which that Day holds out for Christians elsewhere in Paul's thought. One meets here again the familiar contrasts between night and day, darkness and light.[39]

Again, we have already noted how firmly entrenched the cry "the day of the Lord is near" is in the ancient

---

[38]This is not an enthusiastic insistence on that Day's proximity; it sounds much like the result of a later time when the belief in the nearness of the Day was beginning to wane. Though the more primitive mood is given lip-service, the Day is not said to be ἐγγύς, but ἐγγύτερον, which is ultimately insipid. What clinches the argument is the next sentence: ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν. Thus, in Dodd's words, " . . . the eschatology has become little more than an imaginative expression for the urgency which belongs to all moral effort when it is thought of in relation to the eternal issues of life" (The Epistle of Paul to the Romans [New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, n.d.], 210). However, in opposition to Dodd's idea of development in Paul's eschatology, D. E. H. Whiteley, The Theology of St. Paul (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964), 245, says of this passage that it is a close parallel to I Thessalonians 5.4-8. However, "it may well be that St. Paul here has recourse to a stock theme of Christian teaching, in which case its significance as evidence against Dodd is to some extent diminished."

[39]E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958), 379, paraphrases verses four and five: "This does not apply to you quite as it stands; for your condition is not one of darkness, where thieves operate, but of light. For you the day has already dawned." He continues: "This is to give us a glimpse of 'realized eschatology' in the making. Christians belong already to the light and the day, not the night and the darkness."

traditions.[40] Thus, we may here be dealing with the stereotyped call to battle (12). The command is then issued to don the armor of light. However, as was historically the case, the entrance into battle presupposes a spirit of abstention and continence: κώμοις, μέθαις, κοίταις, ἀσελγείαις, ἔριδι and ζήλῳ are forbidden (13). Expressed summarily, this asceticism involves a harnessing of the flesh: καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας(14). What the passage is saying is that the Day is fast approaching, borne on the wings of battle. Therefore, the certainty of war is a foregone conclusion; the only question is whether one will be found a fit soldier.[41]

Though Ephesians six comprises an elaborate picture of Christian military preparedness, we must admit that the familiar imagery is largely missing. In fact, it is anything but certain that τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ(6.13)

---

[40]Thus, J. Bourke, 21: "De tous les clichés mis en oeuvre pour décrire le Jour de Yahvé, la 'proximite' et la 'grandeur' sont les plus communs."

[41]There are of course similarities between this passage and I Thessalonians 5. However, whereas the state of wakefulness is there assumed of the Christian, it is here enjoined. It should be pointed out further that in some way the 'armor of light' in verse 12 and the 'Lord Jesus Christ' in verse 14 are synonymous, for Paul can command that one put both on (ἐνδύω). It is almost as though the very mention of armor conjures up in his memory the war which Jesus waged.

refers to the traditional day of the Lord.[42]

However, verses 10-17 are interesting for the way in which they attest to the transposition undergone by the language of war. In the first place, the idea of God's armor is an ancient one. The words of Isaiah 59.17 witness to this: "He put on righteousness as a breastplate, and a helmet of salvation upon his head; he put on garments of vengeance for clothing, and wrapped himself in fury as a mantle." Again, in Wisdom 5.17-20:

> He shall take to him his jealousy for complete armor, and make the creature his weapon for the revenge of his enemies. He shall put on righteousness as a breastplate, and true judgment instead of an helmet. He shall take holiness for an invincible shield. His severe wrath shall he sharpen for a sword, and the world shall fight with him against the universe.

Now, however, in the present passage, it is no longer God himself who is outfitted with the armor; rather, it is the Christian who is exhorted to prepare himself to fight God's fight: ἐνδύσασθε τὴν πανοπλίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. True it is--and this is not seemingly incommensurate with the battle stance usually depicted in the

---

[42]For instance, Leivestad takes it to refer to the tribulation of the last days. F. W. Beare understands it not as eschatological, but astrological: "the time . . . when the 'unlucky star' is in the ascendant" (!). The Interpreter's Bible (New York: Abingdon Press, 1955), Volume X, 739. To be preferred is the explanation offered by H. L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), Volume III, 617: "Der Apostel scheint bei dem 'böse Tage' an eine Zeit zu denken, in der der Teufel eine ausserordentliche Tätigkeit zur Schädigung der Gläubigen entfalten wird."

New Testament--that this is defensive warfare;[43] whence, however, comes this brazen appeal to enter the fray, bedecked in the divine panoply?

The answer would seem to lie in the fact of Jesus' conclusive clash with the opposition. In closing with the enemy and emerging victorious, he has made it possible for the Christian to war against the mythical host.[44] This fact is what prevents the warfare of the Christian from being regarded as rash and presumptuous.

The Christian battles spiritual foes, not αἷμα and σάρκα (12). The form which the battle imagery here takes, though the precise Holy War terminology is not in vogue, leads to an interesting bit of speculation. The writer

---

[43]Though the μάχαιραν τοῦ πνεύματος (17) is certainly an exception to this. However, the choice of verbs reflects the defensive nature: στῆναι (11,13,14) and ἀντιστῆναι (13). Harnack, 13, says of this passage: "Zugleich aber zeigt eben die Ausführung, dass wirklich Alles, die Waffenrüstung und der Kampf, rein geistlich gemeint ist." However, when he says that the military language is here couched in moral exhortations, which he feels is not the case in the Old Testament, this writer must dissent. The whole history of research into the institution of Holy War has shown how closely intertwined were the martial and moral spheres.

[44]For 6.10 says: ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κράτει τῆς ἰσχύος αὐτοῦ. By κύριος the author could hardly mean any other than Jesus (See 1.2,3,15,17; 3.11 [τῷ χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν] ; 5.20; 6.23,24). Cf. Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 4th ed., 1963), 289:

> Welche Macht das ist, war in 1.18ff schon gesagt: die in der Auferweckung Jesu Christ von den Toten und in seiner Erhöhung über alle Mächte wirksam war. In der Macht des Herrn sind dann auch die Gläubigen allen Mächten überlegen.

of Ephesians (and at least in this respect his thought is close to that of the works which are agreed by all as stemming from Paul) attempts to do justice to two lines of development. In the first place, he is no doubt aware of the immense Holy War traditions. On the other hand, he is a member of the Christian community and is doubtless familiar with the interpretation of Jesus' passion which understood him as having successfully sustained the contest with the foe. Consequently, there are no more real Holy Wars to be fought. However, the sheer weight of the archaic traditions bids him at least do token obeisance to them. The solution consists of a projection of the ideology to the spiritual plane. Therefore, an actual battle still rages, but it is not an earthly battle.[45]

We have thus been enabled to see, from still another direction, that the authentic Holy War traditions are incorporated into certain areas of the New Testament literature. What confirms this is the discovery that the close connection between these traditions and the Day of the Lord tradition is preserved in the New Testament.

It will be recalled that the aim of the present chapter was to trace the development of the Day of the

---

[45] Toombs, 797, agrees:
The early church spiritualized the holy war and saw in it a struggle against Satan, and the demonic forces of the cosmos, the decisive battle of which had been won in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Lord tradition, as this became attached to the Lord of the Christians, Jesus Christ. The fact that such a prestigious tradition was redefined in the face of Jesus helps us to see, initially, that this tradition was considered to be of immediate relevance in the task of reformulation and also serves to underscore the logic involved in assigning the familiar Holy War ideas to Jesus' passion. Evidently the rationale consisted of the following: if the traditional Day of Yahweh could somehow revert to Jesus, then it followed that provision must be made to interpret some aspect of his experience as a Holy War, since the two cycles of tradition were considered inseparable.

If, in the foregoing, we have indicated a certain contiguity between the Day of the Lord tradition and Jesus, as this is particularly seen to be the case in the Pauline literature, the attempt will be made in the next chapter further to demonstrate this contiguity; next, to define it, and, then, to elaborate its implications for the faith of the primitive church.

CHAPTER VI

JESUS THE DAY

In this chapter we wish to approach the current problem from a different route; the aim will be to account for the reshuffling which the ancient ideology of Holy War undergoes within certain parts of the New Testament. For example, it has been our intention to demonstrate that the old traditions are now silouhetted against a cosmic backdrop. Whereas in the Old Testament, for instance, one frequently encounters cosmic language, this is most often used to enhance the epic quality of an earthly war, in the Pauline and Synoptic literature the cosmic imagery is often employed to illustrate a cosmic or mythical war.[1]

Whether one ought to refer to such a spiritualizing as a deterioration of the old categories is not strictly apposite; a preliminary answer would be that the revamping of a tradition so as to allow it to galvanize the minds of those living in a different situation can scarcely be referred to in such terms.

---

[1] One could perhaps speak of a difference at this point between a material and a spiritual cosmology, though these are true as emphases and not as absolutes.

Similarly, what has come into view is the change in perspective undergone by these traditions. Whereas in the prophetic literature of the Old Testament the future is to usher in the Holy War, the Synoptic understanding is that this war, at least to a degree, has been realized in the death and resurrection of Jesus.

We are of the opinion that it is possible to assign an adequate cause to these phenomena. This has to do with the way in which, as we have already seen, the concepts of Holy War and the Day of the Lord were perennially wedded. The dawning of that Day would herald the outbreak of the great, eschatological war. Now, suppose that, for sake of the argument, it might be established that that Day had already come, that it was already a matter of history. The logical conclusion of such unprecedented claims[2] would be that the War had already been fought. Henceforward any suggestion of a final apocalyptic battle would appear contrived and superficial. This would in turn have its effect on the linguistic stock used to describe such an event; it would perforce succumb to a diminution of vitality, becoming jaded and sterile.

It is the thesis of this writer that there are various implicit indications that the time of Jesus was

---

[2]Though, as von Rad, Theology II, 123, notes, "the expression 'the day of Yahweh' could occasionally be used in connection with past events" (Isaiah 22.5; Ezekiel 13.5; 34.12; cf. Lamentations 1.12; 2.22).

designated the Day of the Lord. If it is possible to demonstrate this, it would dove-tail with our prior thesis that the conclusive Holy War was fought by Jesus, most directly in his passion.

Jesus and John the Baptist. We begin with a look at the relation between Jesus and John the Baptist. The question of the identification of John with Elijah who was to come is a vexing one. It may certainly be true that John did not consider himself (or anyone else) to be Elijah redivivus;[3] the fact is that he was understood to have been such by later Christian generations:[4] "The Gospels, as we have them, are, of course, the work of a community that had already accepted the solution that Jesus was the Christ and John his forerunner."[5] This is amply illustrated in Jesus' words to the disciples in Matthew 17.12,13:

---

[3]J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection," New Testament Studies 4 (1958), 265, says that John "could not have thought of himself as Elijah" and that he "never speaks of himself or of any one else as Elijah" (italics his).

[4]Perhaps by Jesus himself. So C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the New Testament (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962), 63. See also C. H. Kraeling, John the Baptist (New York: Charles Scribners' Sons, 1951), 92, 141-145 and Charles H. H. Scobie, John the Baptist (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964), 119-121; 126-129.

[5]Robinson, 276. However, the Fourth Evangelist diverges here. In response to the query put to him by the priests and Levites, John the Baptist answers that he is not Elijah (1.21).

but I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not know him, but did to him whatever they pleased. So also the Son of Man will suffer at their hands. Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them of John the Baptist.

Malachi 4.5 played an important part in these assignations of the Elijaic role to John the Baptist: "Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes." Once the assumption, warranted or not, that John was Elijah the forerunner gained currency, it followed that the "great and terrible day of the Lord" (יהוה יום הגדול והנורא) was to be equated with the life-work of Jesus.[6]

Inherent in the sphere of ideas which comprised the Day complex was, of course, the emphasis on punishment. In Matthew 3.4-12, which might quite conceivably be an expansion of Malachi 4.1-6,[7] judgment is depicted in terms of a raging fire (Malachi 4.1; Matthew 3.10-12). This is, as we have indicated, a traditional description

---

[6]Moule, 63, notes that Jesus, in Matthew 17.12, perhaps intended the startling corollary that his own ministry must be identified with the Day of Yahweh.

[7]Among other similarities, there is in both passages a play on the "father-children" motif. Mark limits John to an announcement of the baptism of the Spirit, omitting mention of the fire (1.8). The expansion of this theme which characterizes Matthew's account undergoes still further amplification in Luke, who retains Mark's "sandals and thong" saying (3.1-17).

of what the appearing of that Day will bring.[8] John's startling announcement, however, is that it is through the agency of a mighty one (ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερος μου ἐστιν . . . αὐτὸς [emphatic] ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·[9]) that the eschatological fire will break out. Thus, whereas Malachi warns that the day, burning like an oven, is coming (בָּעִיר מַבְעִיר הִנֵּה הַיּוֹם בָּא[10]), John, so to speak, hypostaticizes the

---

[8]See Isaiah 34.9,10; Jeremiah 49.27; 51.32; Ezekiel 30.8,16; Joel 1.19; 2.3; 3.3; Zephaniah 1.18. Cf. the Qumran War Scroll 14.1.

[9]3.11.

[10]3.19 (MT). This traditional congeries appears sire to Luke's saying in 12.49: πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη. The proximity of the eschatological fire and Jesus is also stressed in one of the more familiar agrapha: "He that is near me is near the fire; he that is far from me is far from the Kingdom. This agraphon, already long known to us (See Joachim Jeremias, Unknown Sayings of Jesus, translated by R. H. Fuller [London: SPCK, 1964], 66ff), is the 82nd logion of the Sayings Gospel of Thomas: ⲡⲉⲥⲉ ⲓⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲛⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲓ ⲉⲙⲫⲏⲛ ⲉⲧⲉⲫⲧⲉ ⲫⲱⲛ ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲏⲩ· ⲙⲛⲟⲉⲓ ⲭⲟⲩⲏⲏⲩ ⲛⲧⲙⲛⲧⲣⲣⲟ (cf. logia 10 and 16). Of the agraphon Jeremias asks: "What is meant by 'fire'?" He answers: "The parallelism makes it quite clear that it is the eschatological fire, the fire of which Jesus says . . . [Luke 12.49]" (ibid., 72). On this saying see also J. B. Bauer, "Das Jesuswort, 'Wer mir nahe ist,'" Theologische Zeitschrift 15 (1959), 446-450. Cf. I Corinthians 3.13, where the perfect ἀποκαλύπτεται we take to be quite significant: ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερὸν γενήσεται· ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται, καὶ ἑκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει. The most natural understanding of the verse is to take ἡμέρα, not ἔργον as the antecedent of ἀποκαλύπτεται, in which case the verse aligns itself with the Malachi-Synoptic depiction of the day. This use of the perfect to describe a future event is not uncommon; however, may it not be that such certainty, as relates to the Day, is grounded in the fact of Jesus as the Day of the Lord come?

Day and warns that it is the one coming after him who is to kindle that fire.[11] Now, it is quite obvious that for the early Christians this "Mightier One" was none other than Jesus. Therefore, one may say that the New Testament conviction is that what is ascribed to the coming of the Day in the Old Testament is fulfilled in the coming of Jesus; he is, accordingly, in some sense the personification of the Day of the Lord.

Jesus' First Sermon. In this connection it is most interesting to refer to Luke's summary of Jesus' first sermon (4.16-21). Upon having read the passage from Isaiah (61.1,2), Jesus announces:

(21). If one asks as to what is filfilled in Jesus' presence, it is doubtless the acts of mercy which Isaiah had in mind. Thus, the preaching of the good news, the proclamation of release, the recovering of sight and the setting at liberty constitute the acceptable year of the Lord (ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν), which is now upon them. Indeed, the benevolent spirit by which Jesus went about doing good vouches for the veracity of such an audacious claim.

One asks, however, why Luke does not quote the

---

[11] "Fire" is, of course, a traditional emphasis. See Amos 7.4; Ezekiel 38.22; Isaiah 31.9; Malachi 3.2; I Enoch 90.24-27; Psalms of Solomon 15.6; and, in the New Testament, Matthew 5.22; 13.40,42,50; 25.41; Luke 17.29; I Corinthians 3.13-15; II Thessalonians 1.8.

entire verse from Isaiah 61.2, for it reads: "to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor and the day of vengeance of our God (יוֹם נָקָם לֵאלֹהֵינוּ)[12]; to comfort all who mourn." This omission is best explained as a mental lapse, though the emphasis on judgment would not chime in too well with the central emphasis of the verse, namely, benevolence.[13] But it may well be that the whole of the Isaianic passage is here in vogue[14] and that, as a matter of fact, Jesus quoted it in its entirety. At any rate, the double emphasis in that passage would be paralleled by the responses to Jesus' sermon ("All spoke well of him" [22]; after listening further, "all in the synagogue were filled with wrath" [28]). One may add that Jesus' entire ministry implied both the acceptance of those who heard him and the alienation of those who debunked his claims. Thus, if Jesus proclaims the arrival of the favorable year

---

[12] ἡμέρα ἀνταποδόσεως in the Septuagint. See Rowley, 193:

> The passage from Trito-Isaiah, which Jesus read in the synagogue at Nazareth, defines 'the acceptable year of the Lord'--by which what is elsewhere called the Day of Yahweh is meant as 'the day of vengeance of our God.'

[13] However, the next infinitival clause ("to comfort all who mourn") would harmonize with that emphasis; this phrase in fact commences a new variation on the previous theme.

[14] In a manner similar to those passages which C. H. Dodd views as testimonia. See According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., r.p. 1953), 61, 126.

of the Lord as present in himself,[15] in another sense the day of vengeance is supremely present in him as well.

Jesus and the Thief. There are other indications that the Day of the Lord was believed to have been fulfilled in Jesus, in some way. We have earlier alluded to the development of the "thief" motif; we are concerned here only with the last stages of that development. Whereas I Thessalonians 5.2 and II Peter 3.10 apply the description to the day of the Lord, in the Apocalypse the one like a son of man[16] (this apocalyptic figure is, of course, Jesus 1.18) instructs the seer to warn the church at Sardis: "If you will not awake, I will come like a thief, and you will not know at what hour I will come upon you" (3.3).[17]

---

[15]One might compare here Rudolf Bultmann's remarks, which he makes with reference to II Corinthians 6:

> If the salvation-occurrence is present in the proclamation, then the latter belongs to the former as a part of it; as 'ministry' or 'word' of 'reconciliation' . . . it was instituted at the same time. In it, therefore, the eschatological occurrence is taking place; the eschatological 'acceptable time,' the 'day of salvation' foretold by Isaiah 49.8, is present reality in the Now in which the word encounters the hearer.

Theology of the New Testament, translated by Kendrick Grobel (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1965), Volume I, 307.

[16]1.13.

[17]Cf. 16.15. One notes certain affinities with Mark's Passion history. He recounts that a young man fled the scene (14.51,52) of the arrest, leaving his garments. The Evangelist also adds that Jesus was arrested as a robber (14.48) and that the disciples could not remain awake.

Though these passages imply a future reference, the point of importance is that there seem to have been certain circles in the church wherein Jesus was so far felt to have fulfilled the Day of the Lord prophecies that similes applied to the Day could with equal dispatch be applied to Jesus.[18]

The Resurrection and the Origin of Sunday. Finally, by way of introducing our most important datum, let us cite C. H. Dodd, who, after noting the regularity with which the resurrection of Jesus is predicted "on the third day" or "after three days," says:

> It looks as though the prophecy of the restoration of Israel [Hosea 6.2], that is, the Day of the Lord, had been taken as a prophecy of the Day of the Son of Man [which would be quite in accord with the general line by which prophecy passed through apocalyptic into the thought of primitive Christianity], and the 'third day,' as a mysterious indication of the divinely-appointed term for that event. But we observe that the 'three days' recur in the saying about the destruction and restoration of the temple. That raises the question, whether the use of Hosea's prophecy in this way may not go back to Jesus Himself. Might we go so far as to say that the 'third day' is the Day of the Son of Man?[19]

---

[18] If one were to represent this development schematically, the following might be used: 1) The Day = The Thief; 2) Jesus = The Thief; and 3) Jesus = The Day.

[19] Parables, 75. One might just as well substitute Day of the Lord here for Day of the Son of Man. Elsewhere, Dodd seems less diffident. Speaking of Psalm 128, he maintains that

> the whole psalm was evidently interpreted with reference to the sufferings and rejection of Christ, succeeded by His glorious resurrection and exaltation, all of which is 'the Lord's doing, marvellous in our

We hope to show that there is warrant for an affirmative answer to this question (though it might better be said that the Day is applied to the resurrection as a whole) and that Dodd need not be apprehensive lest this suggestion be "wholly fantastic."[20]

In other words, are there indications that the Day of the Lord was thought to have been fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead?[21] If it can be established that this event was so regarded, then this would give a measure of support (as microcosm is related to macrocosm) to our earlier theory that the life-work of Jesus as a whole was so regarded.

Though there is not an abundance of clues in the

---

eyes' [23]--to which the psalmist immediately adds, 'This is the Day which the Lord has made,' which would naturally be understood as indicating that the day of Christ's coming is the prophetic 'Day of the Lord.' Scriptures, 100.

[20] Ibid.

[21] An affirmative answer to this question is, for Markus Barth (Der Augenzeuge: Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel [Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 1946], 147) a matter of course:

> Der Tag der Auferstehung und der Erscheinung Jesu Christi wird durch die Bezeichnung 'Herrentag' als Erfüllung dargestellt und identifiziert mit dem geweissagten 'Tag des Herrn.' Das eschatologische Verständnis des Auferstehung Jesu wird gerade durch diese urchristliche Bezeichnung des Auferstehungstages zum Ausdruck gebracht. . . . Mit Jesu Christi Erscheinung ist es Tag geworden--ist dieser neue Tag, der Herrntag, geschaffen worden und eingetreten.

See also his noteworthy discussion of the terms κυριακὴ ἡμέρα and ἡμέρα (τοῦ) κυρίου, 326, 327n240.

Synoptic passion narratives to guide us, we can here have recourse to a later development. This has to do with the origin of Sunday as the Christian day of worship and the rationale involved in this innovation.

One need not be as skeptical as S. V. McCasland, concerning the provenance of the Sunday-concept,[22] though there is, admittedly, a paucity of information. From the very first mention of a specific day of worship in the Christian community, it is the first day of the week (I Corinthians 16.2; cf. Acts 20.7) which holds a particular prominence.[23] Indeed, this day soon becomes ensconced as the unique time for Christian worship. Hence, it becomes known as the Lord's Day (κυριακὴ ἡμέρα): Revelation 1.10; Didache 14.1; Ignatius to the Magnesians 9.1 and the Gospel of Peter 9.35; 12.50.[24]

Why, one asks, was the first day of the week

---

[22]To him it is a conundrum: "The obscurity surrounding the origin of a weekly celebration of Sunday as the chief day of worship in the early church will probably never be fully removed, due to the meagreness of our information on the point . . ." ("The Origin of the Lord's Day," Journal of Biblical Literature 49 [1930], 65).

[23]However, as Bultmann, Theology I, 123, avers, it is not made certain by these verses whether Paul knows Sunday as the day for congregational worship.

[24]For supplementary data, see the Epistle of Barnabas 15.9; Justin's First Apology 67 and the Dialogue with Trypho 41. It is most instructive that the two occurrences of 'Lord's Day' in the Gospel of Peter are applied to the first Sunday, the day of Jesus' resurrection.

henceforth to be the Christian day of worship? There were, undoubtedly, various contributing factors. The desire to make a clean break with Jewish precedence and to demonstrate the uniqueness of Christianity may have motivated the innovation. Furthermore, Adolf Deismann[25] called attention to evidence that the Imperial cult in Asia Minor and Egypt consecrated one day of each month, apparently the first, to the worship of the emperor and called it σεβαστή. He believes that this day with its name may have had something to do with the name κυριακή[26]

However, while such elucidations of background influences reveal a certain consanguinity between particular Christian and non-Christian emphases, a congenial atmosphere in which the Christian stalk could take root and flourish, the lessons of the past century would impress upon us the methodological impropriety involved in attempting to explain the genius of the Christian message solely in terms of its environment.

As concerns the present problem, it behooves one to trace the origins of this institution of Sunday to

---

[25] Light From the Ancient East, translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan (New York: Harpers, 1922), 358-361.

[26] McCasland, 80, asks: "May not Mithraism with its veneration of Sunday have prepared the way for the Lord's Day?" He answers: "The various considerations of this study suggest such an hypothesis."

indigenous Christian emphases.[27] The first day of the week is known as the Lord's Day because it is on that day that Jesus rose from the dead.[28] Hence it becomes evermore the day on which the community worships; every Sunday becomes a time of commemorating the triumph over evil which occurred on that Day of the Lord.

As will be evident by now, it is our view that κυριακὴ ἡμέρα is derived from ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου.[29] As to

---

[27]See W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962), 74; Jean Danielou, The Bible and the Liturgy (Notre Dame: University Press, 1956), Chapter XV, "The Lord's Day," 242-261 and Mary Pierre Ellebracht, "Sunday: The Day Which the Lord Makes," Worship 39 (1965), 562.

[28]Hence Barnabas can say: διὸ καὶ ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδόην εἰς εὐφροσύνην ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς (15.9). Of this verse, Bultmann says: "Its the first day distinction among the days is given a justification as cultic acts are, out of the history of salvation . . ." Cf. Ignatius to the Magnesians 9.1, wherein death and resurrection are also emphasized.

[29]Ellebracht, 559, notes that the term "day of the Lord" has a twofold meaning.

> On the one hand it is a biblical name for the day, the hour, the moment--any point of historical time--which has been privileged to witness the merciful intervention of God in human life. On the other hand, the 'Lord's Day' is the Sunday, the day set aside for worship.

In answer to her question as to whether there is "any significant relationship between these two meanings of the term" she notes that "the biblical usage of the term has reference to Yahweh's fighting on behalf of his people." Finally, it is

> little wonder, then, that in the early church the day of the Lord meant the 'day of the Kyrios,' the day of the Lord Jesus, the day of him who once and for all had done battle with the powers of darkness on behalf of a new people of God and gained the definitive

precisely why the exact form of the expression was not retained, one can surmise that this phenomenon is illustrative of a certain tension. Though the conviction was that Jesus, in his life, death and resurrection, personified the promised Day of the Lord, it was yet felt that the future would reveal this more fully. There was, accordingly, a double emphasis: that Day was already past, but it was, nevertheless, still to dawn in the future. This tension determined the wording of the terms referring to that Day. To have employed the same form of the expression for both events would have been contradictory. But, on the other hand, the two events were regarded as equally meeting the demands of that Day, so that Sunday, insofar as this day reactualized the events associated with that past Day of the Lord, became known by a term sufficiently close to the traditional term, so that its close correlation with the future Day would be

---

victory (561).
This view is opposed by others. See, for example, Hermann Peichl (ed.), Der Tag des Herrn: Die Heiligung des Sonntags im Wandel der Zeit (Wien: Verlag Herder, 1958), 40.

evident.[30]

We shall have more to say on this point later; here we wish to point out that the occurrences of the terminology argues for such a development. In Revelation 1.10 the seer informs us that it was on the κυριακὴ ἡμέρα that he heard behind him a great voice like a trumpet (φωνὴν μεγάλην ὡς σάλπιγγος). One has but to recall the martial associations of the ancient Day tradition to remember the part that the war-cry and the trumpet-blast played in them. Obviously, then, the Apocalyptist was to a degree shaping the Lord's Day idea in terms of the old Day of the Lord concept.[31]

---

[30]Compare Oscar Cullmann's limpid statement on this phenomenon:

> In the worship of God there now takes place each time that which only at the end of the times forms the conclusion of the redemptive history. Thus also the Christian day of worship, the day of the resurrection of Christ, is called the 'Lord's day,' and here also the thought may be not only of the day of resurrection, but likewise of the day of the Lord, yom Yahweh, which is expected in the future.

Christ and Time, translated by Floyd Filson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), 74,75 (italics his). See also his Early Christian Worship, translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance (London: SCM Press Ltd., r.p., 1962), 91,92: " . . . the Christian Sunday, the Lord's Day, ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου is, in its turn, the anticipation of that other 'day of the Lord,' jom Jahweh, at the end, of which the Old Testament prophets speak." Cf. H. Riesenfeld, "Sabbat et Jour du Seigneur" in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson (Manchester: University Press, 1959), especially page 215.

[31]Paul S. Minear, Christian Hope and the Second Coming (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954), 197: "In prison for Christ's sake, John heard a trumpet on the

Furthermore, that κυριακὴ ἡμέρα is an outgrowth of ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου seems established by Didache 14.1: κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου συναχθέντες κλάσατε ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσατε, προεξομολογησάμενοι τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, ὅπως καθαρὰ ἡ θυσία ὑμῶν ᾖ . What one finds here in κατὰ κυριακὴν δὲ κυρίου is a conflation of the two separate traditions: the Lord's Day (Sunday) and the eschatological Day of the Lord. This conclusion is verified by the balance of the verse, which comprises ideas resembling those in the old Israelite traditions. Thus, the community is to come together (συναχθέντες), much as the warriors of Israel were summoned prior to going out to do battle. The Sunday observance is a sacral affair, as was the Holy War which informs the prophetic Day of the Lord. As then, so now, purity (καθαρὰ) is mandatory, which entails the confession of transgressions, for the sacrifice (θυσία) must not be defiled (κοινωθῇ) (2).[32]

In summary, we have been concerned to indicate that to Sunday was gradually attached the Day of the Lord designation. But this was only a derived appellation; the basis for this was the resurrection of the Lord, which usurped, at least partially, the pride of place belonging

---

Lord's Day! This trumpet was significant of the connection between that particular Sunday and the Day of the Lord."

[32]The Gospel of Peter 9.35 uses κυριακὴ ἡμέρα in the context of the resurrection; soldiers play a big role.

to former depictions of a day in the future. Accordingly, one can allude, from this side as well, to the close correlation, if not identity, between the Day of the Lord and the life and work of Jesus. Indeed, to a great extent, it was felt that in him the yom Yahwah had dawned.[33]

An Agraphon and the Early Church. That the foregoing considerations are not vain conjecture and that they quite probably reproduce the thought of the early church can be demonstrated from a different angle. If the link between the Day and Jesus was already made by the early Christians, one would expect to see indications to that effect in the subsequent literature. One is not disappointed in this regard. There is abundant documentation of the widespread popularity of a seemingly tenacious agraphon, which ascribed to Jesus the words: "I am the Day." Its most articulate formulation comes from Marcellus of Ancyra, as referred to by Eusebius:

> [Marcellus], continuing his exposition affirms that the Savior said: I am the Day [ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἡμέρα], expressing himself thus: Formerly when darkness existed because of the ignorance of the wicked, and when the day was on the point of appearing--for he

---

[33] Henry M. Shires, The Eschatology of Paul in the Light of Modern Scholarship (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966), 31:

> Where necessary, he Paul has departed fearlessly from conventional Jewish eschatology. He has proclaimed that the new age, the expected day of the Messiah, is already here for Christians. Jewish pictures of the coming of the Messiah and the triumphant Day of the Lord are applied both to the first and to

says 'I am the Day'--he rightly names him the morning star and in another place he says: After he had put on flesh, he was proclaimed Christ and Jesus, Life, Way and Day.[34]

That Jesus applied this title to himself is the opinion of a whole host of the church Fathers.[35] To explain this fact Daniélou has recourse to a testimonia hypothesis: " . . . there was a collection of testimonia on the theme of Christ as the Day, to which in particular

---

the second coming of Jesus.

[34]Contra Marcellus I.2.

[35]Jean Daniélou, The Theology of Jewish Christianity, translated by John A. Baker (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964), 92, 123, 168-172, furnishes the documentation. Among those employing the term were: Justin (Dialogue C.4); Clement of Alexandria (Eclogue Prophetae 53.1: "Christ is frequently called Day"); Hippolytus (Ben. Mos. PO 17.171); Ambrose (Exp. Luc. 7.222: "In the mystical sense the Day denotes the Christ"). Other instances: Clement of Alexandria (Stromateis 4.141.3; 6.138.1; 6.145.4-6; 7.43.6; Eclogue Prophetae 3.1); Justin (Dialogue 49.2) and Barnabas 21.3. The last named passage merits further discussion: ἐγγὺς ἡ ἡμέρα ἐν ᾗ συναπολεῖται πάντα τῷ πονηρῷ· ἐγγὺς ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ. It will be recalled that the stress on the imminence of the Day of the Lord was traditional; consequently, it may be that Barnabas is here employing the terminus technicus of that tradition (as is suggested also by the martial nuance of συναπολεῖται). Furthermore, in this parallel construction, ἡμέρα and κύριος are for the author synonymous terms; this has the effect of fortifying our view that the equation Jesus = Day was made by a large segment of early Christianity.

Psalm 117.24 [MT] and Malachi 3.22 [MT] belonged."[36] Now, it is obvious that for the rise of such testimonia there must have been historical warrant. This would, in this writer's view, lie in the early Christian conviction that their Lord had so lived, died and rose that he answered to the prophetic declarations of the coming Day of the Lord. In this sense, the Day has already appeared in history. If we may refer to Daniélou's work once more, he maintains that

> the context from which the logion [Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἡμέρα] derives is most likely to have been the Old Testament. There the expression 'the Day' had at first a technical sense, denoting the eschatological era of the Lord's coming; and this may have been the original source of its application to Christ. Marcellus understands the term along these lines, seeing in 'Day' the name of the Word in his manifestation on earth.[37]

We are not here passing judgment on the authenticity of the logion and are thus not employing it for its own sake. Instead, it is of the utmost value in an indirect sense, as it typifies a prevailing viewpoint as

---

[36] Ibid., 92. Again (169):
What is the origin of this curious title? All the terms quoted in Justin's lists are borrowed from Scripture; likewise, when Clement of Alexandria says that 'Christ is often called the Day,' he clearly means that Christ is often given that title in Scripture. The context of this title therefore, as of the others, must be a collection of testimonia, in which the word 'Day' was mentioned and which accordingly justified the application of the word to Christ.

[37] Ibid., 170. On the background for this agraphon see also Aloys Grillmeier, Christ in Christian Tradition (London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1965), 51,52.

to the correspondence between the life-work of Jesus and the Day of the Lord tradition.

In this concluding section of the chapter, the relationship of what we have just discussed to the previous portions of the work will be spelled out. It will now be seen that the fact that Jesus could be designated the Day serves as a corroborating force to our earlier conclusion that the Passion history is treated by the Synoptists along the lines of a Holy War theology. When the fact of the associative nature of the Holy War and the Day of the Lord traditions is recalled, it becomes clear that the reinterpretation given these two influential cycles explains their relative scarcity in the New Testament. For, on the one hand, since it was felt that Jesus had fought the Holy War of consequence, any future wars could only be peccadillos.[38] Seen from the other side, since the era of Jesus could be thought of as representing the prophesied Day of the Lord,[39] any later explication, on an extensive scale, of this idea with its

---

[38]For a similar view, see L. E. Toombs, 801: While the doctrine of the second coming of Christ . . . made it possible for the New Testament church to retain the idea of a holy war in the end of the days, . . . the vital theological importance of such a war was not felt by the Christian, [because God had won already in Christ's crucifixion and resurrection] and it became a minor motif in New Testament theology.

[39]See Claus Westermann, A Thousand Years and a Day, translated by Stanley Rudman (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962), Introduction.

martial associations, was precluded as well.

It can now be said that the New Testament, as it applies these concepts to Jesus' life-work, does not disrupt their historically concordant relationship. The two realms remain intertwined. The reinterpretation to which they are subjected in the New Testament consists of a certain historicizing. United, they point backward to the consequential and determinative nature of the life-work of Jesus, to that ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου wherein the holiest of holy wars was waged.

The writer conceives of this crucial section of the work as an attempt to contribute to the elucidation of New Testament eschatology under its realized aspects. Though some of the results garnered from this investigation are not entirely novel, the method by which they have been arrived at is felt to be so. The latter was utilized with the hope that it affords a sturdier basis for similar views (e.g., the various works influenced by Aulén's Christus Victor).

CHAPTER VII

THE FUTURE APPLICATION ONCE MORE

If the überlieferungsgeschichtliche approach to the study of the New Testament has underscored anything, it is the fact of the reorientation which the Old Testament and apocalyptic traditions undergo therein. We have attempted to show that this is the case with respect to the Holy War and Day of the Lord traditions. However, attention must be called to the fact that the sands of apocalyptic had not yet run out. After what seems to have amounted to a temporary hiatus, these traditions, with the aid of apocalyptic thought, were once again employed, in the more traditional manner, to elaborate the unfolding of the future.

Some may renege at our labeling these motifs "apocalyptic," inasmuch as the traditions take their rise within the ancient literature of the Old Testament. This provenance and the great longevity of the traditions, to be sure, can hardly be disputed. But, at the same time, we must always ask the related question as to which application of the ideas best explains resultant uses of the traditions. For, as we have emphasized, apocalyptic

literature amplified and embellished the Old Testament treatment of these themes. This same tendency is at work within the various apocalyptic portions of the New Testament (e.g., the Synoptic Apocalypse, some of the Pauline and Catholic Epistles and the Johannine Apocalypse). Therefore, it can be said that it was the Jewish Intertestamental literature which provided the impetus for the recapitulation of the more familiar usages of the traditions. This leads one to credit apocalyptic effusions with an amazing resilience. Not even the ἐφάπαξ character of the life and death of Jesus could bring about their permanent demise.

This conflict on the literary level but bespeaks a tension within the faith of the early church. On the one hand, the work of Jesus was seen as determinative for the life of the church. On the other hand, following the initial flush of frenzied parousiacal expectations, life had settled into its usual sedentary routine. Thus, the captivating aura of these past events, which had prompted the historicizing of the traditions, was, to a degree, eclipsed in favor of a renewed vision of the future.

The Synoptics. Thus, when one turns to these New Testament apocalyptic sections, one finds the ancient Holy War motifs once more applied to a future denouement. As concerns the Synoptic Apocalypse specifically, the old

imagery attaches itself to descriptions of the παρουσία of the Son of Man.[1] The most prolix of these descriptions occurs in Matthew 24.29-31:

> Immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light, and the stars will fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens will be shaken; then will appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven, and then all the tribes of the earth will mourn, and they will see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call, and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

Here the old ideas are revivified. This is true, first of all, with respect to the prodigies which occur in connection with the coming of the celestial figure: the sun will be darkened (σκοτισθήσεται), the moon will not give its light (ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς), the stars will fall from heaven (οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and the powers of heaven will be shaken (αἱ δυνάμεις[2] τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται).[3]

---

[1] That these descriptions portray the coming of the "Son of Man" and not of Jesus specifically, adds to the validity of our thesis. The Son of Man, who was the central figure in the Enochian Apocalypse, is carried over into Christian literature on the wings of this secondary revision of the more primitive Christian tradition.

[2] The martial tenor of the passage is made clearer when one recalls that δύναμις is often employed militarily; see Herodotus, Histories 5.100; Genesis 21.22 (LXX); Josephus, Antiquities 18.262. Often the heavenly bodies (as may be the case here) are thought of as armies: Isaiah 34.4; II Kings 17.16; Daniel 8.10.

[3] σαλεύω recalls the earthquakes which were associated with the ancient wars.

The "sign of the Son of Man" (30), though early interpreted in the sense of an attendant cosmic cross, may, we suggest, be reminiscent either of the pre-arranged signals which summoned the people to battle or of the standards which were often carried into battle (though the Israelites seem not to have practiced this[4]). At any rate, notwithstanding the difficulties encountered in interpreting σημεῖον, the effect of this apparition causes all the tribes of earth to mourn[5] (κόψονται πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς). This no doubt has to do with the havoc and ruin wrought by this coming.

The Son of Man comes with power and great glory (δυνάμεως καὶ δόξης πολλῆς). The term δυνάμεως is a natural, when one keeps in mind the warlike imagery which pervades the account. It may have specific reference to the ἄγγελοι, insofar as these represent his celestial army, and the awesome display of might which these would afford. For their presence is assumed in the next verse.

Verse 31 is of particular interest in the attempt to understand the scenes of military glory which must have been conjured up in the writer's imagination at this point. The Son of Man sends out his angels with a loud

---

[4]But, it seems that the Ark might have served that purpose. See de Vaux, 259. Later, the War Scroll of the Qumran sectaries is replete with mention of signs and standards.

[5]Cf. Zechariah 12.10,12; Revelation 1.7.

trumpet call (σάλπιγγος μεγάλης).[6] Now, it will at once be remembered that it was the sound of the trumpet which ordinarily summoned the army to do battle (Numbers 31.6; Judges 3.27; 6.34;[7] I Samuel 13.3; II Samuel 20.1; II Chronicles 13.12-15).[8]

The purpose of the sending out of the angels is to gather his elect from the four winds (καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων). It is significant that the term ἐκλεκτούς is used to name the faithful. It brings to mind the fact that the ancient holy wars were sacral, covenantal undertakings in which the deity disclosed the might of his outstretched hand for the sake of his <u>elect</u>. Here, the elect are gathered

---

[6]Technically, this is "great trumpet." The variant reading φωνῆς immediately preceding μεγάλης attests to the difficulty and solves it by referring the "great" to the volume of the trumpet blast.

[7]Cf. the Septuagint of Judges 6.34,35a:
καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐνέδυσεν τὸν Γεδεων καὶ ἐσάλπισεν καὶ κερατίνη, καὶ ἐβόησεν Αβιεζερ ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἀγγέλους ἐξαπέστειλεν ἐν παντὶ Μανασση καὶ ἐβόησεν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους ἐν Ασηρ καὶ ἐν Ζαβουλων καὶ ἐν Νεφθαλι, καὶ ἀνέβησαν εἰς συναντησιν αὐτοῦ.
Aside from the terminological affinities, it is interesting that there are attempts to buttress faith evidentially in both passages (Judges 6.36-40; Matthew 24.32-35).

[8]We call attention to the D-reading in verse 31, where it inserts καὶ φωνῆς after σάλπιγγος, which makes the verse speak both about a trumpet and a war-cry (φωνῆς μεγάλης). This would accord even better with the old practices. Trumpets and war-cries were not limited to Israelite Holy Wars. When, however, it is seen that these motifs are blended by Matthew with other standard emphases in that tradition, the impression is accumulatively strengthened that such is the source of this account.

together from all different directions,[9] even as those in the days of old were summoned to prepare for war.

At this juncture the account of the παρουσία, with its combat imagery, trails off. After all, it was not an actual battle that Matthew has in mind; consequently the traditions prove only partially serviceable. One should go on to say that this passage, as one might suppose, resembles the Old Testament Day of Yahweh tradition, which pictured the final and terrible epiphany of the Lord. So, here again one has to do with a coalescing of the two cycles of tradition.

If in Matthew's version of the Synoptic Apocalypse the military background is highly suggestive, though it remains implicit, Luke explicitly elaborates the account of the coming of the Son of Man along martial lines. The way in which this is accomplished is by juxtaposing of historical (or earthly) and apocalyptic (or cosmic) references. His description of the siege of Jerusalem (21.20-24) affords a logical transition to a description of the

---

[9] The verse continues: ἀπ' ἄκρων οὐρανῶν ἕως τῶν ἄκρων αὐτῶν. That our conjecture is not a mere flight into speculative fancy is proved by examining the Isaianic depiction of the Holy War which will take place on the Day of the Lord. A most interesting parallel is afforded by 13.4b,5, which describes the mustering of the host; we cite the Septuagint: κύριος σαβαωθ ἐντέταλται ἔθνει ὁπλομαχῶ ἔρχεσθαι ἐκ γῆς πόρρωθεν ἀπ' ἄκρου θεμελίου τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, κύριος καὶ οἱ ὁπλομάχοι αὐτοῦ, τοῦ καταφθεῖραι τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην.

celestial portents which will signal the approach of the heavenly personage. The question as to whether the Fall of Jerusalem and the Parousia are seen as different aspects of the same event is not germane at this point (though such would seem to be the logical conclusion). Rather, we wish to stress here that Luke has, in this tableau, fused historical and apocalyptic themes by means of a common motif: the threat of war. This threat is, in the Parousia passage (25-28), interpreted in terms of Holy War ideology.

One may certainly not refer to either Matthew or Luke at this juncture as ideologues, since they both consciously adapt the Markan form.[10] However, it is instructive to note the divergences.[11] While Luke omits mention of the sending out of the angels and the sound of the trumpet (the latter of which only Matthew includes) he does make one innovation by graphically underscoring the consternation which the coming will arouse. In the

---

[10]Probably this is true even of Mark; it appears that the apocalypse is a modified version of a pre-Christian Jewish work. However, this view has long been subject to a host of modifications. See, for instance, Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1959), 498ff and Willi Marksen, Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959), 102-108.

[11]Matthew's account resembles Mark much more than does Luke's. It seems as though Luke's ordering of the Parousia narrative has been influenced by the account of the Fall of Jerusalem.

process he affords yet another bit of evidence that the Synoptic portrayals of that coming are based upon the Holy War constellation of ideas. For it will certainly be recalled that the fear and disarray which Yahweh brings upon the enemy host was one of the most elemental aspects of such ideology. According to Luke,

> and there will be signs in sun and moon and stars, and upon the earth distress of nations in perplexity [συνοχὴ ἐθνῶν ἐν ἀπορίᾳ] at the roaring of the sea and the waves, men fainting with fear and with foreboding [ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας] of what is coming on the world; for the powers of the heavens will be shaken (21.25,26).

Now if it is true, as we have conjectured, that the account of the truculent foe which besieges Jerusalem (20-24) has influenced the account of the Parousia, so that the tenor of the passage is extraordinarily marked by foreboding, our view is strengthened. At the very least one can say that it is a militaristic background which has inspired the passage. When one combines these advertences to fear with the several other motifs in these passages, which represent the vestiges of Holy War ideology, the precise provenance of the battle imagery is indicated.

Paul. Lest this representation of the Parousia of the Son of Man by the Synoptic tradition be regarded as a fluke, it must be said that Paul, in I Thessalonians 4.16, 17 takes a similar tack. However, while the Synoptists

speak of the Son of Man, Paul refers to the descent of ὁ κύριος himself[12] (αὐτὸς) (4.16):

> For the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command [κελευσματι][13], with the archangel's call [ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου], and with the sound of the trumpet of God [ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ].[14] And the dead in Christ will rise first; then we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air;[15] and so we shall always be with the Lord.

Here the familiar themes are echoed once more. The cry of command and the archangel's call are combined with the sound of the trumpet of God.[16] The purpose of this clamor is to call together those who are ἐν χριστῷ,

---

[12]Paul, in his early writings, shows a marked reticence to apply completely the Old Testament (here, the Septuagint) titles for the divine to Jesus. In any case, the fact that it is the Lord himself (emphatic) who is to descend we consider significant. For this helps to reveal the Old Testament tone of the passage; the militaristic features of the theophany (or kyriophany) in the balance of the passage were of course originally used in describing the going-forth of Yahweh, man of war.

[13]For other references wherein κέλευσμα has martial overtones, see Proverbs 30.27 (LXX) and Herodotus 4.141 and 7.16.

[14]On the "trumpet" motif, see Minear, who has a chapter entitled "The Trumpet," 189-200. He explains this imagery much as we do. Thus, "we should not overlook the frequency of horns in the war ballads of Israel" (194).

[15]Cf. II Thessalonians 2.1: "Now concerning the coming [παρουσίας] of our Lord Jesus Christ and our assembling to meet him [ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ]. . ."

[16]Here Paul stands closer to Matthew than to the other Synoptic renditions of the cataclysmic arrival of the Son of Man.

both the dead[17] and the living; these will be caught up together (ἁρπαγησόμεθα) in the clouds for a meeting (ἀπάντησιν) with the Lord. Again one is reminded of the devices employed to call Israel together for purposes of waging war. However, the affinity breaks down again at this point; the purpose of the summons is now no longer to fight a war but to meet the Lord. Therefore, it is quite fitting that the passage terminates on a parenetic note:[18] "Therefore comfort one another with these words" (18).[19]

The Apocalypse. Finally, one must peruse the Johannine Apocalypse for similar applications of Holy War theology to future events.[20] At the outset one should say that,

---

[17]It is of the utmost interest that in connection with the Holy War which is for the New Testament determinative (the death and resurrection of Jesus), one finds mention of the resurrection of many saints (Matthew 27.52,53). If this is a limited resurrection, that in connection with the Parousia is evidently not; it appears to include all who are "in Christ." The point is that the description of the Parousia is couched in Holy War terms as well.

[18]This is also the case in the contiguous Day of the Lord passage (5.1-10) (which contiguity is in itself significant, as the two congeries of tradition are seen to commingle in yet another way): "Therefore encourage one another and build one another up, just as you are doing" (11).

[19]As we have noted, the parenetic emphasis is by no means absent from the ancient accounts of Holy War.

[20]It is possible, nonetheless, to find a few othersless-expanded adaptations of the ideology in the New Testament; see I Corinthians 15.51,52.

though considerable space is devoted in this book to descriptions of war, a developed theology of Holy War, in its technical sense, is not readily discernible. This would, on the surface, seem paradoxical. But, it echoes, at the same time, the contrast to which we have continually noted in our discussion: i.e., the ample opportunities to expound Holy War doctrine and the comparatively few occasions when this was actually taken advantage of.

As to why this is the case one may hazard a guess. The afflatus which inspired the in extenso applications of Holy War theology seems not to have stirred this apocalyptist because of the nature of the subject matter. Holy War ideology proper attaches to historical events; though there is often mythical and cosmic embroidery in the accounts of such events, that embroidery serves to accentuate the significance of human history. This is so far true that the prophetic writers of the Old Testament, even in explaining the inexplicable future, employ our ideology in portraying that future in earthly, natural categories. If the relation of the mythical to the historical proved in this whole sphere of ideas to be a viscuous one, the former was subjugated to the latter.

As one turns to the Johannine Apocalypse, one finds himself in a mythical world. The old Holy War and Day of the Lord traditions are found to be of little utility in a work in which the earthly is sublimated.

The old categories do not fit. Though there are a number of reminiscences of Holy War theology, these are desultory; there is a demonstrable lack of cohesiveness and of the familiar pyramiding of the related themes.

In view of this feature, perhaps the best approach is to treat the occurrences of the customary motifs in topical fashion. First, trumpets play a large part in the book (8.2,6,7,8,10,12,13; 9.1,13,14; 11.15); it is true that they are employed a few times as harbingers of war (9.1,13).[21]

There are numerous references to portents and prodigies. In this respect one sees in 6.12-14 the kind of amplification apocalyptic delights to indulge:

> When he opened the sixth seal, I looked, and behold, there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth, the full moon became like blood, and the stars of the sky fell to the earth as the fig tree sheds its winter fruit when shaken by a gale; the sky vanished like a scroll that is rolled up, and every mountain and island was removed from its place.[22]

Finally, the two traditions are most suggestively

---

[21]The account of the locust-warriors (9.3ff) undoubtedly has the description in Joel as its Vorlage. This weighty precedent does not, however, preclude its transformation. While there are certainly mythical tinges in the Joelic account, in Revelation the description is thoroughly mythologyzed.

[22]See also 8.5,11; 11.13,19; 16.18-20. The term σημεῖον (12.1,3; 15.1) is best translated "portent"; it suggests terrible signs in the heavens.

linked once more in 16.14-16.[23] In this case it is the πνεύματα δαιμονίων (in the Synoptic apocalypse it is the ἄγγελοι who summon the elect) who assemble (συναγαγεῖν) the "kings of the whole world" for battle on the "great day of God the Almighty" (τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος). The author localizes this conflict in the valley of Megiddo, which had by that time become famous as a scene of numerous battles; it was there that nature fought for Deborah, Barak and the Israelites against Sisera in one of the most famous of the ancient Israelite Holy Wars (Judges 5.19).

In verse 15 a voice breaks in to say: "Lo, I am coming like a thief." It is obvious who is meant here, on the basis of 3.3. The significance of this lies in the fact that, even in the midst of discussing the future apocalyptic war, the seer is obliged to broach a more distinctively Christian theme, on the basis of his recollection that the Day was, in many respects, fulfilled in Jesus.[24]

---

[23] The expression ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν occurs in 6.17. The appearing of that day prompts panic:

> Then the kings of the earth and the great men and the generals and the rich and the strong, and every one, slave and free, hid in the caves and among the rocks of the mountains, calling to the mountains and rocks, 'Fall on us and hide us from the face of him who is seated on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb.'

[24] See also 12.7-10, of which Windisch, 75, says: "Hier wird der messianische Kampf in der Form des alten Mythus vom Götterkampf geschildert."

So that, while the Holy War tradition, in its precise form, does not play a vital role in the Christian Apocalypse, enough remains to indicate the reprojection into the future which it underwent. This is confirmed by the Synoptic Apocalypse and the Pauline literature, wherein the more familiar terminology recurs.

As this relates to our previous attempts to isolate the levels of Christian tradition, with respect to the issue of Jesus and Holy War, it appears that, in the earliest circles, two associated notions were popular. If, on the one hand, Jesus was pictured as having engaged in a Holy War, on the other hand, it was felt that the Day had been realized in him.

At a somewhat later time (though it may well be that these varying emphases trace to differences of locale, as much as to differences in time), it seems that the excision of certain abrasive, Zealotically-tinctured elements in the record about Jesus was combined with a return to the more familiar uses of apocalyptic. This meant that the ancient traditions were once more employed in an elaboration of the future denouement.

CONCLUSION

It is a commonplace that the New Testament employs martial thought at various points. The Synoptic tradition can portray Jesus as a warrior, the Christian is pictured at war with powers and principalities and the Apocalyptist describes the cosmic struggle with verve. In the case of the Gospels, it is Luke who most frequently couches his message in the nuances of war.

To what is this parlance to be attributed? It is the contention of this writer that this represents the remains of ancient Holy War ideology, which was an integral part of numerous and diverse cultures. In such ideology the religious and military realms are fused, with the leadership of the army relegated to the deity. Such ideas obtained in ancient Israel as well; however, in view of the historically-oriented nature of Israelite faith, many of the mythical elements attaching to the ideology in other civilizations were sloughed off, so that one finds Yahweh, from the beginning, participating in <u>human</u> wars.

Analysis of such ideology and the historical applications made of it (by the Old Testament prophets,

the Maccabees, the Qumran sectaries and the Zealots) reveals certain standard motifs which persisted through the centuries. The fact that the war is a cultic undertaking means that the warriors must enter the fray ritually pure, having abstained from the normal marital relations. Ordinarily the trumpet summons the people to battle; fighting commences with a loud war-cry, calculated to inspire panic in enemy ranks. Since God himself marches in the van of the army, he can call upon terrestrial and celestial prodigies to attend the efforts of his people and to discomfit the foe. As a result, fear and trepidation seize the enemy and he is obliged to admit the presence of the supernatural in the opposition army. The climax of the Holy War is the putting of the foe under the ban, which involves the extermination of survivors. This, however, is nothing but the taking over of the spoils which are rightfully due God.

Distinctions must, therefore, be made between ordinary wars and Holy Wars. While it is true that the technical language of Holy War recurs in the New Testament, it must be said that imprecise methodology has resulted in far too much of the literature being subsumed under this ideology. One who examines the Synoptic picture of Jesus finds that the technical motifs are focused almost exclusively on the Passion history. In this case it is Matthew who makes greatest use of the old ideas.

Jesus is made to prepare himself ritually for the conflict. Having consulted the will of the divine, he goes forth alone to challenge the foe. Having endured the machinations of the enemy to the end, Jesus utters a loud cry (war-cry?), which in turn signals the appearance of the familiar portents and prodigies. This of course induces terror among the soldiers at the scene.

Thus, the traditional ideology is used to demonstrate the conclusive and determinative nature of Jesus' conflict on the cross (though the foe is not explicitly identified). This fact explains the comparatively limited use of the Holy War tradition in the accounts of Jesus' life, though there is (particularly in the exorcism narratives) an element of bitter conflict. That the old ideas should receive such cursory application is strange, in view of the continual proximity of the Zealotic "fringe." For, some of Jesus' disciples are identified, either by name or mentality, with the Zealots. Thus, while there was ample opportunity to define Jesus' life in terms of a thorough-going theology of Holy War, this was not effected, for the most part due to the fixation of the theology on the passion scene.

Nevertheless, Zealotic ideas are still discernible within the Synoptic corpus. This leads one to ask whether Jesus himself was a Zealot or whether the early tradition mistakenly represented him as one. The latter

appears to be the case; care was taken by later circles to expunge certain offensive features from the story of Jesus.

On the other hand, how is one to account for the presence of Holy War ideas within the New Testament? Though the weighty Holy War precedents provided the mediate impetus, the immediate factor was the Day of the Lord tradition. This tradition can properly be viewed as a catchword, mention of which would at once recall a spate of Holy War notions, since the two traditions had long been closely associated.

A survey of the origin and development of the Day of the Lord tradition reveals both consistent and variable features. It is agreed by scholars that the tradition is native to Israel. The notion is best explained (along the lines of Gerhard von Rad's reconstruction) as originally informed by ancient Israel's incursions into Holy War. The different terms employed in the formula indicate the genius of the development: the Day of Yahweh, the Day of Judgment, the Day of the Son of Man, the Day of Jesus Christ and the Lord's Day (Sunday).

This demonstrates the flexibility inherent in the concept from the beginning and explains how this Old Testament idea could be applied to Jesus (via its ascription to the Son of Man), primarily in the Pauline literature. That this Day was assigned to Jesus had various

consequences, among which was an increasingly optimistic prospect for the believer, as regards that Day. This, however, is not to be construed as chauvinism, but points again to the conclusive nature of Jesus' Holy War; he has made it possible for the Christian to don the divine panoply and battle the invisible host.

Various lines of evidence converge to confirm the fact that the Eschatological Day of the Lord was somehow personified in the life-work of Jesus. These lines are represented by the relationship of Jesus to John the Baptist, Luke's report of Jesus' first sermon, the development involved in the "thief" motif and the origin of Sunday as the day of worship in the Christian community. All of this is substantiated by a tenacious agraphon, which was extremely widespread in the early church and which ascribed to Jesus the words: "I am the Day."

However, the influence of apocalyptic thought on early Christian theology meant that the dual tradition (Holy War and the Day of the Lord) was again shunted to the future, so that, in the apocalyptic portions of the New Testament (and Paul) the cataclysmic coming of the Son of Man is elaborated with the aid of the familiar emphases.

The present writer has sought to employ the history-of-traditions approach to afford a scientific basis for certain hypotheses which are not uncommon. To

this end it has been thought essential to trace the origins and development of the relevant traditions, so that the question as to whether they actually recur within the New Testament writings could be answered. This task assumes also the identification of literary motifs which cluster around those traditions. It is our feeling that this kind of disciplined and restricted approach lessens the possibility of rash and unfounded views regarding either the relative abundance or paucity of these traditional themes within the New Testament.

If the first issue at stake was the mere isolation of the traditions within the New Testament, the second had to do with the manner in which they are employed. As was continually the case in the Old Testament and its literary descendants, so also in the Christian literature, we found a constant tension between the wish to retain the old ideas and the need to adapt and reinterpret them. What has emerged most noticeably from this analysis is the reductionist tendency to which the traditions of the Holy War and the Day of the Lord were subjected in the New Testament. We have endeavored to explain this as due to the determinative significance accorded to Jesus, particularly to his death and resurrection. While this significance, with respect to the dual tradition which we have studied, does not always come explicitly to the fore, we have attempted to demonstrate that the articulation of

this significance employed these ancient categories, though this was partially obscured by the later development. Furthermore, it was this primary orientation of the traditions which helped to preclude the development of a sophisticated New Testament doctrine of Holy War, in its technical sense; spiritualization was the result. However, the latter tendency is important in that it witnesses to the indelibleness of the traditions; they could not be simply sloughed off.

If now, as we have hoped to illustrate, the Holy War and Day of the Lord traditions become attached to the record of Jesus, so that he is in some sense the personification of the Day and at the same time fights the Holy War *par excellence*, it is clear that the eschatological ideas which were part-and-parcel of these traditions are to an extent realized. But, at the same time, ascribable particularly to the renewed influence of apocalyptic thought, these traditions are, though most generally only in random, *ad hoc* fashion, focused once more on the future. In this respect, the present work can be taken as a contribution to the discussion of the dialectical relationship between realized and future aspects of New Testament eschatology.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

ALTHAUS, PAUL. Die letzten Dinge: Lehrbuch der Eschatologie. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1949.

ANDERSON, HUGH. Jesus and Christian Origins. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.

ATHANASIUS. The Life of St. Antony. Translated by Robert T. Meyer. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1950.

AULEN, GUSTAF. Christus Victor: An Historical Study of the Three Main Types of the Idea of the Atonement. Translated by A. G. Hebert. London: SPCK, 1953.

BACH, ROBERT. Die Aufforderungen zur Flucht und zum Kampf im Alttestamentlichen Prophetenspruch. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.

BARTH, MARKUS. Der Augenzeuge: Eine Untersuchung über die Wahrnehmung des Menschensohnes durch die Apostel. Zurich: Evangelischer Verlag Ag. Zollikon, 1946.

BEASLEY-MURRAY, G. R. A Commentary on Mark Thirteen. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1957.

_____. Jesus and the Future. London: Macmillan and Company, Ltd., 1954.

BEARE, F. W. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.

BEST, ERNEST. The Temptation and the Passion: The Markan Soteriology. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.

BIETENHARD, HANS. Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spatjudentum. Tübingen: Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1951.

BONNER, GERALD. The Warfare of Christ. London: Faith Press, 1962.

BORNEMANN, W. Die Thessalonicherbriefe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1894.

BOUSSET, WILHELM. Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1926.

BOUYER, LOUIS. The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers. Translated by Mary P. Ryan. New York: Desclee Company, 1963

BRANDON, S. G. F. The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. London: SPCK, 1961.

BRANSCOMB, B. HARVIE. The Gospel of Mark. New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.

BULTMANN, RUDOLF. Das Evangelium des Johannes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.

_____. History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM Press, Ltd., Volume I, 1965.

CAIRD, G. B. Jesus and the Jewish Nation (Ethel M. Wood Lecture). University of London: Athlone Press, 1965.

_____. Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1956.

_____. The Apostolic Age. London: Gerald Duckworth and Company, Ltd., r.p., 1958.

ČERNY, LADISLAV. The Day of Yahweh and Some Relevant Problems. V Praze: Nákladem Filosofické Fakulty University Karlovy, 1948.

CHARLES, R. H. Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism and Christianity. New York: Schocken Books, r.p., 1963.

CLEMENTS, R. E. Prophecy and Covenant. Naperville: Allenson, 1965.

CRIPPS, R. S. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Amos. London: SPCK, 2d ed., 1960.

CROSS, FRANK MOORE JR. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1961.

CULLMANN, OSCAR. Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.

_____. Early Christian Worship. Translated by A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance. London: SCM Press Ltd., r.p., 1962.

_____. The State in the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.

CUMONT, FRANZ. The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. New York: Dover Publications, r.p., 1956.

DANIÉLOU, JEAN. The Bible and the Liturgy. Notre Dame: University Press, 1956.

_____. The Theology of Jewish Christianity. Translated by John S. Baker. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964.

DAUBE, DAVID. The Sudden in the Scriptures. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964.

DEISSMANN, ADOLF. Light From the Ancient East. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. New York: Harper and Brothers, 4th ed., 1922.

DE VAUX, ROLAND. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1961.

DIGNATH, WALTER. Kirche - Krieg - Kriegsdienst. Hamburg; Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag GmbH, 1955.

DOBSCHÜTZ, ERNST V. Die Thessalonicherbriefe. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1909.

DODD, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet and Co., Ltd., r.p., 1953.

_____. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, r.p., 1964.

_____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. New York: Harper and Brothers, n.d.

DODD, C. H. The Parables of the Kingdom. London: Collins Press, 1961.

EISSFELDT, OTTO. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1965.

FARMER, WILLIAM REUBEN. Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period. New York: Columbia University Press, 1956.

FISON, J. E. The Christian Hope: The Presence and the Parousia. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1954.

FREDRICKSSON, HENNING. Jahwe als Krieger: Studien zum alttestamentlichen Gottesbild. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1945.

FROST, S. B. Old Testament Apocalyptic. London: Epworth Press, 1952.

FULLER, REGINALD H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.

_____. The Mission and Achievement of Jesus. London: SCM Press, r.p., 1963.

GALLOWAY, ALLAN D. The Cosmic Christ. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

GASTER, T. H. The Dead Sea Scriptures. New York: Doubleday, rev., 1964.

GLASSON, T. F. His Appearing and His Kingdom. London: Epworth Press, 1953.

_____. The Second Advent. London: Epworth Press, 3rd ed., 1963.

GRESSMANN, HUGO. Der Ursprung der israelitische-jüdischen Eschatologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1905.

GRILLMEIER, ALOYS. Christ in Christian Tradition. London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, Ltd., 1965.

GRUNDMANN, W. Der Begriff der Kraft in der Neutestamentlicher Gedankenwelt. Stuttgart, 1932.

GURNEY, O. R. The Hittites. Baltimore: Penguin Books, rev., 1964.

GUY, H. A. New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance. London: Epworth Press, 1947.

HARNACK, ADOLF. Militia Christi: Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1905.

HEIDEL, WILLIAM ARTHUR. The Day of Yahweh: A Study of Sacred Days and Ritual Forms in the Ancient Near East. New York: The Century Company, 1929.

HENGEL, MARTIN. Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. Bis 70 No. Chr. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

HOOKER, MORNA. Jesus and the Servant. London: SPCK, 1959.

JEREMIAS, JOACHIM. The Parables of Jesus. Translated by S. H. Hooke. London: SCM Press, 1963.

_____. Unknown Sayings of Jesus. Translated by R. H. Fuller. London: SPCK, 2nd ed., 1964.

KABISCH, RICHARD. Die Eschatologie des Paulus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893.

KALLAS, JAMES. The Significance of the Synoptic Miracles. London: SPCK, 1961.

KLAUSNER, JOSEPH. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.

KNOX, W. L. St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1939.

KRAELING, C. H. John the Baptist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

KUMMEL, W. G. Promise and Fulfilment. Translated by Dorothea M. Barton. London: SCM Press Ltd., 2d ed., 1961.

LADD, G. E. Jesus and the Kingdom. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964.

LANGTON, EDWARD. Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine. Its Origin and Development. London: Epworth Press, 1949.

LAWSON, JOHN. The Biblical Theology of Saint Irenaeus. London: Epworth Press, 1948.

LEIVESTAD, RAGNAR. Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament. London: SPCK, 1954.

LIETZMANN, HANS. A History of the Early Church. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: World Publishing Company, Volume IV, r.p., 1964.

LOHSE, EDUARD. Die Geschichte des Leidens und Sterbens Jesu Christi. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1964.

MCCASLAND, J. V. By the Finger of God. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1957.

MACDONALD, JOHN. The Theology of the Samaritans. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

MANSON, T. W. The Servant-Messiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1961.

_____. The Teaching of Jesus: Studies of its Form and Content. Cambridge: University Press, 1963.

MARSH, JOHN. The Fulness of Time. London: Nisbet and Company, Ltd., 1952.

MARXSEN, WILLI. Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1959.

MASSAUX, ÉDOUARD et. al. La Venue de Messie: Messianisme et Eschatologie. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1962.

MATTERN, LIESELOTTE. Das Verständnis des Gerichtes bei Paulus. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1966.

MILIK, J. T. Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea. Translated by John Strugnell. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1959.

MINEAR, PAUL S. Christian Hope and the Second Coming. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.

MOODY, DALE. The Hope of Glory. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.

MORRIS, LEON. The Biblical Doctrine of Judgment. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.

MORRISON, CLINTON. The Powers That Be: Earthly Rulers and Demonic Powers in Romans 13.1-7. Naperville: Allenson, 1960.

MOULE, C. F. D. The Birth of the New Testament. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.

MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND. He That Cometh. Translated by G. W. Anderson. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1959.

_____. Psalmenstudien. Amsterdam: Schippers, 2 Volumes, 1961.

_____. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. New York: Abingdon Press, Volume I, 1962.

NEIL, WILLIAM. The Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

NOCK, ARTHUR DARBY. St. Paul. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, r.p., 1963.

NORTH, C. R. The Old Testament Interpretation of History. London: Epworth Press, r.p., 1953.

PEDERSEN, JOHANNES. Israel: Its Life and Culture. London: Oxford University Press, Volumes III and IV, r.p., 1959.

PEICHL, HERMANN (ed.). Der Tag des Herrn: Die Heiligung des Sonntags im Wandel der Zeit. Wien: Verlag Herder, 1958.

PERRIN, NORMAN. The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.

PLÖGER, OTTO. Theokratie und Eschatologie. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1959.

POWELL, CYRIL H. The Biblical Concept of Power. London: Epworth Press, 1963.

PRITCHARD, JAMES B. (ed.). Ancient Near Eastern Texts. Princeton: University Press, 2d ed., 1955.

RINGGREN, HELMER. Israelite Religion. Translated by David Green. London: SPCK, 1966.

ROBINSON, H. WHEELER. Inspiration and Revelation in the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, r.p., 1950.

ROBINSON, JAMES M. The Problem of History in Mark. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.

ROBINSON, J. A. T. Jesus and His Coming. London: SCM, 1957.

ROBINSON, T. H. and HORST, FRIEDRICH. Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.

RORDORF, WILLY. Der Sonntag: Geschichte des Ruhe- und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.

ROWLEY, H. H. Jewish Apocalyptic and the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Athlone Press, 1957.

_____. The Faith of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

RUSSELL, D. S. The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1964.

SCHLIER, HEINRICH. Der Brief an die Epheser. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 4th ed., 1963.

_____. Principalities and Powers in the New Testament. New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.

SCHÜTZ, RUDOLPHE. Les Idées eschatologiques du Livre de la Sagesse. Paris: Libraire Orientaliste Paul Geunther, 1935.

SCHWEITZER, ALBERT. Paul and His Interpreters: A Critical History. New York: Schocken Books, r.p., 1964.

SCOBIE, CHARLES H. H. John the Baptist. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1964.

SELWYN, E. G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958.

SHIRES, HENRY M. The Eschatology of Paul in the Light of Modern Scholarship. Philadelphia: Westminster.

SMEND, RUDOLF. Jahwekrieg und Stämmebund: Erwägungen zur ältesten Geschichte Israels. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963.

STAUFFER, ETHELBERT. New Testament Theology. Translated by John Marsh. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1963.

STEINMANN, JEAN. Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

STRACK, H. L. and BILLERBECK, PAUL. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Volume III, 1926.

TAYLOR, VINCENT. The Gospel According to St. Mark. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1959.

TODT, HEINZ EDUARD. The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.

VOLZ, PAUL. Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1934.

VON RAD, GERHARD. Der heilige Krieg im alten Israel. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1951.

_____. Old Testament Theology. Translated by David Stalker. London: Oliver and Boyd, Volume I, r.p. 1963; Volume II, 1965.

_____. Studies in Deuteronomy. Translated by David Stalker. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1953.

VON WALDOW, EBERHARD. Der traditionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund der prophetischen Gerichtsreden. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1963.

VÖÖBUS, ARTHUR. History of Asceticism in the Syrian Orient. Louvain: Secrétariat du Corpus SCO, 1958.

WATTS, J. D. W. Vision and Prophecy in Amos. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1958.

WESTERMANN, CLAUS. A Thousand Years and a Day. Translated by Stanley Rudman. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

WHITELEY, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.

WHITLEY, C. F. The Prophetic Achievement. London: A. R. Mowbray and Company, 1963.

WILLIAMS, GEORGE H. Wilderness and Paradise in Christian Thought: The Biblical Expression of the Desert in the History of Christianity and the Paradise Theme in the Theological Idea of the University. New York: Harpers, 1962.

WILSON, JOHN; JACOBSEN, THORKILD; FRANKFORT, HENRI and H. A. Before Philosophy. Baltimore: Penguin Books, r.p., 1964.

WINDISCH, HANS. Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum. Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1909.

_____. Der zweite Korintherbrief. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.

YADIN, YIGAEL (ed.). The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness. Translated by Batya and Chaim Rabin. Oxford: University Press, 1962.

ARTICLES

ACHTEMEIER, PAUL J. "Person and Deed: Jesus and the Storm-Tossed Sea," Interpretation 16 (1962), 169-176.

ATKINSON, K. M. T. "The Historical Setting of the 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness,'" Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 40 (1958), 272-297.

AVI-YONAH, M. "The 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' and Maccabean Warfare," Israel Exploration Journal 2 (1952), 1-5.

BARRETT, C. K. "New Testament Eschatology," Scottish Journal of Theology 6 (1953), 136-155; 225-243.

BAUER, J. B. "Das Jesuswort, 'Wer mir nahe ist,'" Theologische Zeitschrift 15 (1959), 446-450.

BAUERNFEIND, OTTO. "πόλεμος," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Volume VI, 501-515.

_____. "στρατεύομαι κτλ," Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Volume VII, 701-713.

BETZ, OTTO. "Jesu Heiliger Krieg," Novum Testamentum 2 (1957), 116-137.

BLACK, MATTHEW. "The Eschatology of the Similitudes of Enoch," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 3 (1952), 1-10.

_____. "The 'Son of Man' in the Old Biblical Literature," Expository Times 60 (1948/1949), 11-15.

BOEHMER, J. "Tag und Morgenstern," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 24 (1923), 228-233.

BONNARD, PIERRE. "La Signification du désert selon le Nouveau Testament," in Hommage et Reconnaissance, Karl Barth. Paris: Neuchâtel, 1946, 11-18.

BOURKE, J. "Le jour de Yahve dans Joel," Revue Biblique 66 (1959), 5-31; 191-212.

BRINKMANN, B. "Die Lehre von der Parusie beim Hl. Paulus in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Anschauungen des Buches Henoch," Biblica 13 (1932), 315-334; 418-434.

CANON, W. W. "The Day of the Lord in Joel," Church Quarterly Review (1926), 32-63.

COUTURIER, FERNAND. "Le 'Jour de Yahvé' dans l'Ancien Testament," Revue de l'Université d' Ottawa 24 (1954), 193-217.

CREIG, JAMES C. G. "The Eschatological Ministry," in Hugh Anderson and William Barclay (eds.). The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965, 99-131.

DAVIES, W.D. "Reflections on Archbishop Carrington's The Primitive Christian Calendar," in Christian Origins and Judaism. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1962, 67-95.

DELLING, GERHARD and VON RAD, GERHARD. "ἡμέρα," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Volume II, 1964, 943-953.

ELLEBRACHT, MARY PIERRE. "Sunday: The Day Which the Lord Makes," Worship 39 (1965), 559-566.

FARMER, W. R. "The Palm Branches in John 12,13," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 3 (1952), 62-66.

FLOROVSKY, GEORGES. "Empire and Desert: Antinomies of Christian History," Greek Orthodox Theological Review 3 (1957), 133-159.

FOERSTER, WERNER. "δαίμων," in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, Volume II, 1964, 1-19.

FORSTER, GERHARD. "I Thessalonicher 5, 1-10," Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 17 (1916), 169-177.

FRIDRICHSEN, ANTON. "The Conflict of Jesus With the Unclean Spirits," Theology 22 (1931), 122-135.

FUCHS, D. ERNST. "Die Zukunft des Glaubens nach 1. Thess. 5, 1-11," in Glaube und Erfahrung: zum christologischen Problem im Neuen Testament (Gesammelte Aufsätze III). Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1965, 334-363.

GOETZE, ALBRECHT. "Warfare in Asia Minor," Iraq 25 (1963), 124-130.

GOGUEL, M. "Eschatologie et apocalyptique dans le Christianisme primitif," Revue de l'histoire des religions 106 (1932), 381-434; 489-524.

GRUNDMANN, W. "Überlieferung und Eigenaussage im eschatologischen Denken des Apostels Paulus," New Testament Studies 8 (1961), 12-26.

HAYES, JOHN H. "The Tradition of Zion's Inviolability," Journal of Biblical Literature 82 (1963), 419-426.

HART, H. ST. J. "The Crown of Thorns in John 19.2-5," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series 3 (1952), 66-75.

JENNI, ERNST. "Day of the Lord," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, Volume I, 784,785.

JENSEN, E. E. "The First Century Controversy over Jesus as a Revolutionary Figure," Journal of Biblical Literature 60 (1941), 261-272.

KAPELRUD, A. S. "God as Destroyer in the Preaching of Amos and in the Ancient Near East," Journal of Biblical Literature 71 (1952), 33-38.

KÄSEMANN, ERNST. "Die Anfange christlicher Theologie," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 57 (1960), 162-185.

_____. "Epheserbrief," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 3rd ed., 1958, II. Band, 517,518.

_____. "Zum Thema der urchristlichen Apokalyptik," in Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen II. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965, 105-131.

KUHN, KARL GEORG. "Jesus in Gethsemane," Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952), 260-285.

KUHN, KARL GEORG. "New Light on Temptation, Sin, and Flesh in the New Testament," in Krister Stendahl (ed.). The Scrolls and the New Testament. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957, 94-113.

KUTSCH, ERNST. "Heuschreckenplage und Tag Jahwes in Joel 1 und 2," Theologische Zeitschrift 2 (1962), 81-94.

LAMMERT, E. and F. "Kriegskunst," in Pauly-Wissova Real-Encyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922, Volume XI, Columns 1827-1858.

MCCASLAND, SELBY VERNON. "The Origin of the Lord's Day," Journal of Biblical Literature 49 (1930), 65-82.

MACCULLOCH, J. A. "Eschatology," in Hasting's Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1937, Volume V, 379.

MACDONALD, JOHN. "The Day of Judgment in Near Eastern Religions," Indo-Iranica 14 (1961), 33-53.

MACGREGOR, G. H. C. "Principalities and Powers: The Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," New Testament Studies 1 (1954), 17-28.

MANSON, T. W. "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 32 (1950), 171-193.

MANSON, WILLIAM. "Principalities and Powers: The Spiritual Background of the Work of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels," Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas 3 (1952), 7-17.

MICHEL, O. "Krieg III. Im NT," in Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1960, Volume IV, 66.

MILLER, PATRICK D. JR. "God the Warrior," Interpretation 19 (1965), 39-46.

MONTEFIORE, HUGH. "Revolt in the Desert?," New Testament Studies 8 (1961), 135-141.

MOULE, C. F. D. "The Influence of Circumstances on the Use of Eschatological Terms," Journal of Theological Studies 15 (1964), 1-15.

MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND. "Yahves dag," Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 59 (1959), 97-108.

MURDOCK, WILLIAM R. "History and Revelation in Jewish Apocalypticism," Interpretation 21 (1967), 167-187.

NOUGAYROL, J. "Guerre et paix à Ugarit," Iraq 25 (1963), 110-123.

PORTER, F. C. "The Place of Apocalyptical Conceptions in the Thought of Paul," Journal of Biblical Literature 41 (1922), 183-204.

RIESENFELD, HARALD. "Sabbat et Jour du Seigneur," in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.). New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. Manchester: University Press, 1959, 210-217.

RIST, MARTIN. "Day of Christ," in The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, Volume I, 783.

ROBINSON, J. A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus: An Essay in Detection," New Testament Studies 4 (1958), 263-281

ROWLEY, H. H. "Qumran, the Essenes and the Zealots," in J. Hempel and L. Rost (eds.). Von Ugarit nach Qumran. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1961, 184-192.

SCHMIDT, KARL LUDWIG. "Die Natur- und Geistkräfte im paulinischen Erkennen und Glauben," Eranos-Jahrbuch 14 (1946), 87-143.

SCHUNCK, K.-D. "Struckturlinien in der Entwicklung der Vorstellung vom 'Tag Yahwes,'" Vetus Testamentum 14 (1964), 319-330.

SMITH, J. M. P. "The Day of Yahweh," American Journal of Theology 5 (1901), 505-533.

SOGGIN, J. ALBERTO. "Der prophetische Gedanke über den heiligen Krieg, als Gericht gegen Israel," Vetus Testamentum 10 (1960), 79-83.

STEWART, JAMES S. "On a Neglected Emphasis in New Testament Theology," Scottish Journal of Theology 4 (1951), 292-301.

TOOMBS, L. E. "War, Ideas of," in Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962, Volume IV, 796-801.

VON RAD, GERHARD. "The Origin of the Concept of the Day of Yahweh," Journal of Semitic Studies 4 (1959), 97-108.

VON SODEN, WOLFRAM. "Die Assyrer und der Krieg," Iraq 25 (1963), 131-144.

WESTERMANN, CLAUS. "The Way of the Promise Through the Old Testament," in Bernhard W. Anderson (ed.). The Old Testament and Christian Faith: Essays by Rudolf Bultmann and others. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1964, 200-224.

WINTER, PAUL. "Magnificat and Benedictus--Maccabaean Psalms?," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 37 (1954), 328-347.

WOLFF, HANS WALTER. "Der grosse Jesreeltag: Methodologische Erwagungen zur Auslegung einer altestamentlichen Perikope," Evangelische Theologie 12 (1952), 78-104.